

God's Steadfast Love Towards a New Conception of Old Testament Theology (*)

Anyone talking about Old Testament theology in the present state of research is taking a risk in a situation where the validity of this approach is challenged⁽¹⁾. The relationship between Old Testament theology and the history of Israel's religion is at stake. Should the history of Israel's religion be regarded as superior to Old Testament theology or even as the better Old Testament theology⁽²⁾? After all, it can do without those

(*) This lecture was delivered on the occasion of the 90th anniversary of the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome on 6th of May 1999. This published version has been revised and completed. I should like to thank Dr. Karin Schöpfli most affectionately for undertaking the laborious task of translating the German manuscript into English.

(¹) The emergence of the conflict, recent positions and my own point of view are comprehensively explained in my contribution "Die Verbindlichkeit des Alten Testaments. Unzeitgemäße Betrachtungen zu einem ungeliebten Thema", *JBTh* 12 (1997) 25-51. The literature on the subject referred to in that contribution will not be repeated here. In addition, cf. the following recent publications: H.-J. HERMISSON, "Jesus Christus als externe Mitte des Alten Testaments. Ein unzeitgemäßes Votum zur Theologie des Alten Testaments", *Jesus Christus als die Mitte der Schrift*. Studien zur Hermeneutik des Evangeliums. (FS. O. Hofius [Hrsg. C. LANDMESSER – H.-J. ECKSTEIN – H. LICHTENBERGER] BZNW 86; Berlin – New York 1997) 199-233; B. JANOWSKI, "Der eine Gott der beiden Testamente. Grundfragen einer Biblischen Theologie", *ZTK* 95 (1998) 1-36 (= ID., *Die rettende Gerechtigkeit*. Beiträge zur Theologie des Alten Testaments [Neukirchen-Vluyn 1999] II, 249-284); O. KAISER, *Der Gott des Alten Testaments*. Wesen und Wirken. Theologie des Alten Testaments (UTB 2024; Göttingen 1998) II; M. KÖCKERT, "Von einem zum einzigen Gott. Zur Diskussion der Religionsgeschichte Israels", *BThZ* 15 (1998) 137-175; H.-P. MÜLLER, "Alttestamentliche Theologie und Religionswissenschaft", "Wer ist wie du, HERR, unter den Göttern? (FS. O. Kaiser [Hrsg. I. KOTTSIEPER et al.] Göttingen 1994) 20-31 (= ID., *Glauben, Denken und Hoffen*. Alttestamentliche Botschaften in den Auseinandersetzungen unserer Zeit [Altes Testament und Moderne 1; Münster 1998] 249-260); O.H. PESCH, "Schriftauslegung – kirchliche Lehre – Rezeption. Versuch einer ökumenischen Zusammenschau in Thesen", *Verbindliches Zeugnis* (Hrsg. T. SCHNEIDER – W. PANNENBERG) (DiKi 10; Freiburg i. Br. – Göttingen 1998) III, 261-287; W.H. SCHMIDT, "Einsichten und Aufgaben alttestamentlicher Theologie und Hermeneutik", *VF* 43 (1998) 60-75; *Biblische Theologie*. Entwürfe der Gegenwart (Hrsg. H. HÜBNER – B. JASPERT) (BThSt 38; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1999).

(²) This view has been held by R. ALBERTZ, "Religionsgeschichte Israels statt Theologie des Alten Testaments! Plädoyer für eine forschungsgeschichtliche

restricting theological limitations which become inevitable if you are to interpret a fixed canon of scriptures as Old Testament theology does. The historian of Israel's religion is obliged to give priority to all literary sources available and to the relics of the material culture. For him, the biblical canon is only one collection of sources among others, and by no means the most important. Is not the historian of Israel's religion in the better position to reconstruct and describe the religion's development more objectively? This has to be admitted in a purely historical respect. The task of an Old Testament theologian, however, is different. The Old Testament theologian has to accept the biblical canon as the basis of his task. The idea of the biblical canon is aimed at conveying and preserving the voice of truth among the manifold voices of the witnesses. You cannot write a theology of the Old Testament without being aware of the obligation towards the truth of Scripture within the scriptures of the canon. While a history of Israel's religion is a purely historical undertaking, a theology of the Old Testament has to do justice to the normative collection of the biblical canon. While a historian of Israel's religion may consider whether the monotheism of the biblical scriptures is a regrettable restriction compared with the options of polytheism a theologian of the Old Testament has to argue in favour of monotheism and to make clear why the witnesses of the biblical canon are so determined in this respect.

Thus, each discipline, the history of Israel's religion and the theology of the Old Testament, has its own right, respectively. They can be clearly distinguished and are of mutual benefit. On the one hand, the Old Testament theologian will accept the history of Israel's religion as a critical reconstruction of the past and will apply it productively. On the other hand, the historian of Israel's religion will accept that the variety of religious documents he has critically described represents various claims of truth. The criteria promoting the one claim of truth within the biblical canon are of purely theological nature. They are the subject of Old Testament theology. One cannot prove with historical arguments that monotheism is a higher form of religion than polytheism. This is a normative decision made by metahistorical arguments. Old Testament theology is the discipline for promoting these arguments as convincingly as the biblical scriptures did.

Umorientierung", *JBTh* 10 (1995) 3-24. His position has produced a lively debate documented in *JBTh* 10 (*Religionsgeschichte Israels oder Theologie des Alten Testaments?*) and in *JBTh* 12 (1997) (*Biblische Hermeneutik*).

Supporting this view of Old Testament theology is just the starting point of serious trouble. As a matter of fact, there are different biblical canons with different perceptions of truth promoted by different communities of faith. The problem is very delicate, as the relation of the Jewish to the Christian Bible is concerned. It is of vital importance to be clear on the canonical basis which is to be interpreted. By using the term 'Old Testament' the intention is indicated to practice Old Testament theology as a segmentary field of a theology of the Christian Bible⁽³⁾. The Old Testament is neither identical with the Jewish Bible nor are Hebrew Bible and Old Testament interchangeable terms. The Old Testament owes both its name and the realization of its truth to the second part of the Christian Bible, the New Testament, or at least to the predominant subject of the New Testament scriptures, the witness of Jesus Christ. Old Testament theology necessarily depends on New Testament theology and on the Bible in which the realization of Christ has been perceived, namely in the Greek version of the Old Testament, roughly speaking, in the Septuagint⁽⁴⁾. Originally a Jewish Bible as well, it is this version of the Old Testament with its Greek language, with its number and arrangement of biblical scriptures which prepared the way for the understanding of the life and death of Jesus Christ⁽⁵⁾.

⁽³⁾ This view is met with in the major work of B. S. CHILDS, *Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments*. Theological Reflection on the Christian Bible (London 1992).

⁽⁴⁾ Cf. H. FREIHERR VON CAMPENHAUSEN, *Die Entstehung der christlichen Bibel* (BHT 39; Tübingen 1968); M. HARL – G. DORIVAL – O. MUNNICH, *La Bible grecque des Septante*. Du Judaïsme hellénistique au Christianisme ancien (ICA; Paris 1988); E.E. ELLIS, *The Old Testament in Early Christianity* (WUNT 54; Tübingen 1991); M. MÜLLER, *Kirkens første Bibel. Hebraica sive Graeca veritas?* (Frederiksberg 1994) (Engl. transl.: *The First Bible of the Church. A Plea for the Septuagint* [JSOTSS 206; Sheffield 1996]); D. TROBISCH, *Die Endredaktion des Neuen Testaments*. Eine Untersuchung zur Entstehung der christlichen Bibel (NTOA 31; Freiburg, Schweiz – Göttingen 1996); J.W. WEVERS, "The Interpretative Character and Significance of the Septuagint Version", *Hebrew Bible / Old Testament*. The History of its Interpretation (ed. M. SÆBØ) (Göttingen 1996) I/1, 84-107; cf. the response to M. Müller by K. JEPPESEN, "Biblia Hebraica – et Septuaginta", *DTT* 58 (1995) 256-266 (Danish) – *SJOT* 10 (1996) 271-281 (English); cf. also the contributions in *Kristna tolkningar av Gamla Testamentet: bidrag från en Lundakonferens om kristen tolkning av Gamla testamentet*, Stiftsgården Åkersberg, Höör, den 26 – 27 april 1996 (ed. B. OLSSON) (Stockholm 1997).

⁽⁵⁾ There are different orders of the biblical scriptures in the three famous manuscripts Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Vaticanus (both 4th century) and Codex Alexandrinus (5th century). They have in common that Daniel is incorporated in the prophetic writings in order to stress their concern in predicting future

The Septuagint was the nucleus of the Christian Bible. Moreover, the Septuagint with its synthesis of Jewish and Hellenistic legacy was the matrix for the formation of Christianity. Any Old Testament theologian who conceives his discipline as a part of the theology of the Christian Bible will have to consider the Greek version of the Old Testament at least as carefully as the Hebrew version. These presuppositions, presented here in rough outline, are the basis for the material concept of Old Testament theology which attempts to do justice to the Hebrew and to the Greek voices in four steps.

I. God's Self-Determination towards Steadfast Love

One might be surprised that I hold God's self-determination towards love to be the origin of an Old Testament theology. This characterization would rather suggest a New Testament theology. But according to the presuppositions of an Old Testament theology noted above, the truth of Old Testament theology can only be established by considering New Testament theology. This is the reason why I characterize God's self-determination towards love by the theological category of origin, and not by the historical category of beginning. God's self-determination of love becomes evident by his decision to establish a special loving relation with mankind which is realized in a unique love-story, namely God's love for Israel. This is obvious for the Old Testament's own basic position and from the New Testament's point of view as well.

Within the traditions of the Old Testament the love-story originates in the Pentateuch. When you attempt to grasp Pentateuchal theology in

developments. This intention is equally emphasized by the tendency to put the prophetic corpus in the final position of the collection of the biblical books. As this order is definitely achieved in Codex Vaticanus, it cannot be excluded that the arrangement is due to Christian influence. Since it is already documented in the list of biblical scriptures by Melito of Sardes (2nd century) and basically by Origen (3rd century), one can at least consider whether there has been a preceding Jewish tradition; the order of the Old Testament scriptures in the manuscripts mentioned above and in patristic lists can be found in H.B. SWETE, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge 1902; repr.: New York 1968) 200-214; a comprehensive presentation of the sources and the problems involved is given by M. HENGEL (in cooperation with R. Deines), "Die Septuaginta als 'christliche Schriftensammlung', ihre Vorgeschichte und das Problem ihres Kanons", *Die Septuaginta zwischen Judentum und Christentum* (Hrsg. M. HENGEL – A.M. SCHWEMER) (WUNT 72; Tübingen 1994) 182-284.

the most important issue, you may not focus on YHWH as a god of a nomadic people or a god of a mountain or a god who asserted his monotheistic claim over a long period of time, first coexisting with other gods, and later on contending with them. This would be the subject of a history of Israel's religion. Aiming at Pentateuchal theology you should rather take monotheism as the starting point and direct attention to the theological topics which the composers of the Pentateuch emphasized most. In this respect it is obvious that in both the Deuteronomistic and the Priestly compositions and, accordingly, in the final shape of the Pentateuch, the events at Sinai are the center of interest. They are characterized by the contrast between theophany, legislation, covenant and vision of God on the one hand, and Israel's breaking of the covenant on the other. The latter is illustrated by the Golden Calf and its adoration. The original revelation of that God who brings out of Egypt and preserves his people in the wilderness is immediately confronted with Israel's original sin, namely their love affairs with other gods. God's love story with Israel does not exist without adultery and disloyalty. The confrontation of God's presence in Israel and Israel's original sin provokes the question: How can God continue to be present in Israel — not as a destroyer, but even as a redeemer?

In the situation of betrayed love Israel's God himself describes his character in a new theophany and proclaims how he is going to treat Israel (Ex 34):

‘The LORD passed before him (Moses), and proclaimed, “The LORD, the LORD, a God merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and abounding in steadfast love and faithfulness, ⁷ keeping steadfast love for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, but who will by no means clear the guilty, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children and the children's children, to the third and the fourth generation” (6). (RSV)

(6) Cf. the interpretation of the context in Exod 32–34 and 19–34, respectively, by E. AURELIUS, *Der Fürbitter Israels. Eine Studie zum Mosebild im Alten Testament* (CB.OT 27; Stockholm 1988) 91–126; E. ZENGER, “Wie und wozu die Tora zum Sinai kam: Literarische und theologische Beobachtungen zu Exodus 19–34”, *Studies in the Book of Exodus. Redaction – reception – interpretation* (ed. M. VERVENNE) (BETHL 126; Leuven 1996) 265–288. The formula quoted above has been analysed and called the (enlarged) ‘formula of grace’ by H. SPIECKERMANN, “‘Barmherzig und gnädig ist der Herr...’” ZAW 102 (1990) 1–18; C. DOHMEN, “Der Sinaibund als Neuer Bund nach Ex 19–34”, *Der Neue Bund im Alten. Studien zur Bundestheologie der beiden Testamente* (Hrsg. E. ZENGER)

As an answer to Israel's adultery God confirms his love and faithfulness. As this confirmation is uttered in the third person, it is obvious that it was probably used as a hymnic formula in cultic praises of God. In Exod 34, however, it is intentionally shaped as divine speech, because regarding the original sin of idolatry, only God himself can say how he will continue to be perceivable for the Israelites. God remains true to Israel in remaining true to his self-determination towards his **חסד**, his steadfast love⁽⁷⁾. However, hurt by adultery God's love takes the shape of mercy and grace, of abstaining from anger and of being ready to forgive the thousands (i.e. numerous) of generations without any limit, although the punishment restricted to four generations would not fail to come. But this is not as remarkable as its juxtaposition, namely God's unlimited love that remains true to Israel. God immediately confirms his self-determination by a new covenant and by a new proclamation of his law (Exod 34,10-27)⁽⁸⁾.

The hymnic formula of God's lasting self-determination towards love has a history extending far back into Canaanite myths. I would describe this in a history of Israel's religion. In an Old Testament theology, however, the main point is that God's self-determination as found in Exod 34 has produced a history of its own within the Old

(QD 146; Freiburg 1993) 51-83; concerning the elements of the formula cf. the articles in the theological dictionaries: H.J. STOEBE, "**רחם** *rhm* pi. sich erbarmen" *THAT* II, 761-768; H. SIMIAN-YOFRE – U. DAHMEN, "**רחם** *rhm*", *TWAT* VII, 460-477; H. J. STOEBE, "**חנן** *hnn* gnädig sein", *THAT* I, 587-597; D.N. FREEDMAN – J. LUNDBOM – H.-J. FABRY, "**חנן** *hānan*", *TWAT* III, 23-40; E. JOHNSON, "**אָהַבָה**", *TWAT* I, 388-389; H.J. STOEBE, "**חֶסֶד** *hēsəd* Güte", *THAT* I, 600-621; H.-J. ZOBEL, "**חֶסֶד** *həsəd*", *TWAT* III, 48-71. The current debate on the appropriate understanding of **חסד** has been advanced by K.D. SAKENFELD, *The Meaning of Heseḏ in the Hebrew Bible: A New Inquiry* (HSM 17; Missoula 1978); E. KELLENBERGER, *həsəd wä "mät als Ausdruck einer Glaubenserfahrung* (AThANT 69; Zürich 1982); G. R. CLARK, *The Word Heseḏ in the Hebrew Bible* (JSOTSS 157; Sheffield 1993) (Lit.); in addition, cf. the surveys by J.S. KSELMAN, "Grace", *ABD* II, 1084-1086; K.D. SAKENFELD, "Love", *ABD* IV, 375-381; H. SPIECKERMANN, "Gnade/Gnade Gottes. II. Altes Testament", *RGG*⁴ III (forthcoming).

(7) There is no doubt that **חסד** is the leading term within the formula as the enlargement of the formula of grace in Exod 34,7 is to be understood as an interpretation just of this term.

(8) The recent discussion on Exod 34,11-26 is documented and evaluated by F.-L. HOSSFELD, "Das Privilegrecht Ex 34,11-26 in der Diskussion", *Recht und Ethos im Alten Testament – Gestalt und Wirkung* (FS. H. Seebass [Hrsg. S. BEYERLE – G. MAYER – H. STRAUß] Neukirchen-Vluyn 1999) 39-59; C. KÖRTING, *Der Schall des Schofar. Israels Feste im Herbst* (BZAW 285; Berlin – New York 1999) 34-38.

Testament⁽⁹⁾. Before we examine this history closely we will have a final look at the formula itself. Its nucleus proclaims Israel's God as a god of love and faithfulness. The crucial Hebrew term for this is **חסד**, often explained by **אמת**. The Septuagint translates both nouns with adjectives, *πολυέλεος καὶ ἀληθινός* 'very merciful and truthful' (¹⁰). In the Authorized Version both terms are translated by 'abundant in goodness and truth', the (New) Revised Standard Version says 'steadfast love and faithfulness', and the Jerusalem Bible renders 'kindness and faithfulness'. These references to the Septuagint and different English translations may appear confusing, but they prove the semantic complexity of the terms **חסד** and **אמת**. The semantic spectrum coloured by **חסד** is marked by the terms grace, mercy, compassion, kindness, love, that of **אמת** by faithfulness and truth. 'Faithful love' and 'steadfast love' seem to be appropriate terms to signify how God perceives his relation towards Israel in this central passage of the Sinai pericope.

The final shape of the Sinai pericope conveys the same message as its Deuteronomistic precursor did earlier⁽¹¹⁾: God does not determine

(⁹) The formula of grace occurs in Joel 2,13; Jonah 4,2; Ps 86,15; 103,8; 145,8; Neh 9,17; references of the enlarged formula or references presupposing the enlarged formula are to be found in Exod 34,6-7; 20,5-6 = Deut 5,9-10; 7,9-10; allusions to the formula can often be assumed, but not always be proved, cf. Deut 4,31; Exod 33,19; Num 14,18; Isa 48,9; 54,7-8; 63,7; Jer 15,15; 32,18; Mic 7,18; Nah 1,2-3; Ps 78,38; 86,5; 99,8; 111,4 belonging together with 112,4; 116,5; Dan 9,4; Neh 1,5; 9,31-32; 2 Chr 30,9; Sir 2,11; 5,4-7 et al.

(¹⁰) In addition, the Septuagint expands the version at the beginning of Exod 34,7 interpreting the resumed term **חסד** now rendered by 'mercy': *καὶ δικαιοσύνη διατηρῶν καὶ ποιῶν ἔλεος* 'who preserves righteousness and practises mercy'. This demonstrates that the translators understood quite well the postexilic Psalter's theology where God's righteousness is indeed perceived in his **חסד** (cf. Ps 51,3-6; 103,17; 143,11-12; 1QS x 2-5.12-16).

(¹¹) The Priestly composition adopts the central idea of the Deuteronomistic concept of the Sinai pericope and focusses the establishing of the cult predominantly on the atonement of sin. God's presence in Israel remains possible only in this manner. The theology of atonement within the Sinai pericope is the priestly variant of the Deuteronomistic theology comprising God's love, faithfulness and covenant as opposed by adultery, disloyalty and breaking of the covenant.

The story of creation and fall in Gen 2-3 reflects the last elaboration prompted by this way of thinking. Of course, this presupposes that the text in its final form is the product of a time when the Priestly Code was already written; cf. E. OTTO, "Die Paradieserzählung Genesis 2-3", *"Jedes Ding hat seine Zeit..."*. Studien zur israelitischen und altorientalischen Weisheit (FS. D. Michel [Hrsg. A. DIESEL et al.] BZAW 241; Berlin - New York 1996) 167-192; R.G. KRATZ - H. SPIECKERMANN,

his relationship with Israel momentarily, but fundamentally. He does so not before he has had any experience with Israel, but right at the climax of the crisis occurring during his love-story with Israel, namely having adultery in view. At this point, God's love takes the shape of faithfulness and mercy that is willing to forgive — not only once, but once and over again. All this is expressed by the word חסד in Exod 34,6-7 and the enlarged formula of grace, accordingly. We will now scrutinize some important references to God's self-determination towards love that shed light on the further development of this central notion in the Old Testament.

II. Living in God's Saving Presence: the Psalter

That God has determined himself towards love in the primeval situation at Mt. Sinai has influenced Israel's living in the presence of God. The people as a whole and also every individual Israelite always considered themselves as being dependent on the saving God. The Psalter offers abundant evidence for this. The cultic-spiritual sphere of the Psalter created its own way of theological thinking and speaking. For centuries it kept its distance from the Pentateuchal theology focussing on salvation-history and legislation. Within a history of Israel's religion I would show Israel's special commitment to the cult and prayers of the Ancient Near East and the multiple processes of adaption. Within an Old Testament theology, however, I am concerned with the question what theological powers reconciled the various theological conceptions and what held them together thereafter.

"Schöpfer/Schöpfung. II. Altes Testament", *TRE* 30, 258-283; H. SPIECKERMANN, "Ambivalenzen. Ermöglichte und verwirklichte Schöpfung in Genesis 2f", *Verbindungslinien* (FS. W. H. Schmidt [Hrsg. A. GRAUPNER et al.] Neukirchen-Vluyn) (forthcoming). God's loving care for men and the rise of preconscious love between the first human beings are accompanied by the Fall. Because of the Fall the fatal mixture of love and sin affects mankind from the beginning, although in terms of the theological perception the origin of betrayed love is situated at Mt. Sinai. In Gen 2-3, however, the beginning precedes the origin on purpose, at least in the final form of the Pentateuch. It appears as though God would find his original nature for the first time in meeting the alternative to preserve or to extinguish his own people at Mt. Sinai. Although there are similar situations in the primeval history requiring God's decision to preserve or to extinguish mankind, his self-determination towards love is directed towards Israel exclusively at Mt. Sinai leaving unsettled his relation towards the nations and mankind. This question is a predominant matter of debate in the prophetic writings.

The idea of *חסד* is one of the most characteristic features in the Psalter. Word-statistics easily make this evident. Out of 245 occurrences in the Old Testament *חסד* is found 127 times in the Psalter. Of these, 124 occurrences refer to God's *חסד*. No other Old Testament writing can compare with this frequent use of the term which occurs in 54 Psalms out of 150. Apart from the refrain in Ps 136 'for his steadfast love endures forever' (26 occurrences) the word is not significantly concentrated in any special text. Rather, the term is one of the fundamental theological categories within the Psalms' theology; as the Psalter as a whole underwent a process of being added to, and supplemented with theological ideas in the course of the centuries, so did this term. Most of the Psalter's references already presuppose the crucial importance of God's *חסד* in the Sinai event.

Presumably, the individual lament in Ps 61 still preserves a reminiscence of the pre-exilic idea of *חסד* just without reference to the Sinai pericope. The psalmist prays to God that he might again shelter his life which is endangered by the underworld and by enemies. The thought of sheltering is condensed by metaphorical speech, namely the metaphor of the everlasting abode in God's tent which is an image of the temple. Abiding in God's tent does not imply living within the circle of the Temple's walls, of course. Anyone whose life is centred on God's presence emanating from the temple may abide in God's tent or under the shelter of his wings. This fits in with Ps 61 as a whole; it concludes with a plea for the king.

⁷ Prolong the life of the king;
may his years endure to all generations!

⁸ May he be enthroned forever before God;
appoint steadfast love and faithfulness (*חסד ואמונה*) to watch over him! ⁽¹²⁾

⁽¹²⁾ Cf. J. BECKER, "Die kollektive Deutung der Königpsalmen", *ThPh* 52 (1977) 561-578, 572 (= *Studien zum Messiasbild im Alten Testament* [Hrsg. U. STRUPPE] [SBAB 6; Stuttgart 1989] 291-318, 308-309). It is highly probable that the passage dealing with the king would be understood in postexilic times as a coded reference to the people.

The understanding of *ן* in 61,8 causes difficulties. Many exegetical options and emendations have been brought forth, cf. the selection made by C.A. BRIGGS – E.G. BRIGGS, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms* (ICC; Edinburgh 1907) II, 67; G. RAVASI, *Il libro dei Salmi*. (Lettura della Bibbia; Bologna 1985) II, 242, n. 16. It is no more than a 'piccolo enigma', indeed, most probably 'et tilfældigt Indskud i Teksten' (F. BUHL, *Psalmterne*. [Kjøbenhavn 1900] 405).

Steadfast love and faithfulness are qualities of God himself which, passed on the king, ensure the stability of the land and the safety of every Israelite threatened by powers of the world and the underworld. The king on David's throne is God's mandatary in Jerusalem and the mediator of his blessing. He transmits the divine gifts to his people. This can be achieved by righteous government, as one may gather from the similar expression in Prov 20,28⁽¹³⁾. חסד ואמת in Ps 89,15 have a similar function. They are forces in God's presence paralleled by צדק ומשפט "righteousness and justice" that build up the foundation of God's throne⁽¹⁴⁾. All these notions together show that they belong to the theology of God's kingship focussing on God's granting the welfare of his king and his people. חסד plays an important part among the divine gifts guaranteeing God's order in the world for Israel's benefit.

Turning to the later phases of the Psalter's theology we have to recall that in the meantime God's self-determination towards faithful love was included in the composition of the Pentateuch. This may explain why God's חסד likewise developed into a theological keyword of the Psalter. Finally, it has been regarded as the most important theological term there is to describe God's being and acting in the realm of the Psalter's theology. This is the case in Ps 136. The refrain declares 26 times 'for his חסד (steadfast love) endures for ever'. The psalm describes God as the creator, the governor and preserver of the universe (136,2-9.25). It encloses the presentation of the master of salvation history who acted in support of his people on the occasion of the exodus, in leading them through the wilderness, giving the land and rescuing them from any humiliation. Each single divine deed proves God's eternal nature inherent in the term חסד. God's steadfast love is present in creation and in history more than abundantly. The universal claim is once more stressed in the exterior frame of the psalm

⁽¹³⁾ It is significant that the Septuagint renders the foundation of the royal throne בחסד by ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ 'by righteousness' — a free but appropriate translation (cf. Prov 16,12; 25,5).

⁽¹⁴⁾ Although the history of these notions goes back to preexilic times, Ps 89 in its present shape should be regarded as a postexilic text (cf. M. EMMENDÖRFFER, *Der ferne Gott. Untersuchung der alttestamentlichen Volksklagelieder vor dem Hintergrund der mesopotamischen Literatur* [FAT 21; Tübingen 1998] 203-239). The same applies to the similar references Ps 85,11-14 (cf. EMMENDÖRFFER, *ibid.*, 248-251) and 97,2 (cf. J. JEREMIAS, *Das Königtum Gottes in den Psalmen. Israels Begegnung mit dem kanaanäischen Mythos in den Jahwe-König-Psalmen* [FRLANT 141; Göttingen 1987] 137-143).

(136,1.26). The Lord, the God of heaven (אל השמים⁽¹⁵⁾) (136,26), is טוב 'good' (136,1). God's being good emanates into creation as his חסד 'steadfast love'. Everyone living in the Persian period and later in the Hellenistic age — not only in Israel — is able to perceive this as God's true nature. Of course, God's being good means above all his goodness as the Septuagint appropriately interprets טוב, rendering it as χρηστός 'merciful' (136,1 MT = 135,1 LXX)⁽¹⁶⁾. This is in accordance with the practice of the Septuagint which translates חסד predominantly by ἔλεος 'mercy'⁽¹⁷⁾ foreshadowed in late Psalms' interpreting חסד by רחמים 'mercy'⁽¹⁸⁾. God's love has to be conceivable as goodness and mercy, if it is to affect men in Israel. The more time passes, the more the Israelites become aware that they themselves are incapable of being righteous (cf. Ps 143,2) and that, therefore, they are completely dependent on the good and merciful God⁽¹⁹⁾.

In the Psalms the good and merciful God proves to be the saving God⁽²⁰⁾. This correlation is exemplified frequently. When the psalmist relies on God's חסד, his heart may rejoice in God's salvation (Ps 13,6). In post-exilic times the pre-exilic theological concept is embedded in a system of numerous relations. Praising God's steadfast love (חסד) and faithfulness (אמת) is to proclaim God's righteousness (צדקה), truth (אמונה) and salvation (תשועה) (Ps 40,10-11). Thus, praising God's true

⁽¹⁵⁾ Cf. אלהי השמים in Ezra 1,2; Neh 1,4; 2,4.

⁽¹⁶⁾ The Septuagint's translation of טוב (noun and adjective) by χρηστός and χρηστότης, respectively, is not the normal one. The usual rendering is — as expected — ἀγαθός, followed by καλός. The translation by χρηστός and χρηστότης, respectively, occurs predominantly in the Psalms expressing God's goodness.

⁽¹⁷⁾ According to the numbering of the Septuagint cf. Ps 17,51; 20,8; 22,6 (ἔλεος rendering טוב וחסד); 24,7.10; 30,8.17.22; 58,11.17.18 (אלהי חסדי rendered by ὁ θεός μου, τὸ ἔλεός μου) and more than 70 other references in the Psalter alone.

⁽¹⁸⁾ Cf. Ps 25,6; 40,12; 51,3; 69,17; 103,4; references outside the Psalter: Isa 63,7; Jer 16,5; Hos 2,21; Zech 7,9; Lam 3,22; Dan 1,9.

⁽¹⁹⁾ In Ps 86,5, God's being good is interpreted as his willingness to forgive (טוב וסלח). In the immediate context, רב־חסד is mentioned, supplying an additional reason to regard the whole verse as an actualization of the formula of grace quoted in 86,15. Matters are similar in Ps 145,7-9 quoting the formula of grace in a context that stresses God's universal goodness and mercy. These characterisations are supported by his righteousness towards men, i.e. bringing about deliverance and justification (cf. SPIECKERMANN, "Barmherzig und gnädig ist der Herr...", 12, 16-17).

⁽²⁰⁾ Cf. H. SPIECKERMANN, *Heilsgegenwart. Eine Theologie der Psalmen* (FRLANT 148; Göttingen 1989).

nature means two things at the same time: doing his will (40,8-9) and asking for his grace (40,12). Doing God's will is not a burden, but delight. It is pronounced in a scroll as instruction (תורה) that intends to enter into men completely as a relief and as a claim (40,8). Or to put it differently according to the same psalm: The psalmist enters the scroll as if he entered God's temple (הנהבאחי, 40,8; cf. 73,17), because God is entirely present in both. This entering into God's wholesome, saving and gracious presence, however, does not exempt the psalmist from world and sin, but rather prompts him to accept the Torah affectionately and to ask to be protected by God's steadfast love and faithfulness (40,12). Not until confronted with the abundance of God's grace does the psalmist perceive the abundance of evil in the world and in his own life, an abundance that exceeds in number the hairs of his head (40,13). But God's love is greater than men's sin. The pleas are addressed to a god whose steadfast love and faithfulness are well approved. Therefore, the lamentation does not gain a dominating position in Ps 40. Rather, the psalmist hopes to be soon reintegrated in the congregation of those who are called אהבי חשועתך 'lovers of your salvation' (40,17 = 70,5). This designation corresponds with the Hebrew title of the Psalter: תהלים 'hymns'. Under the aspect of God's saving presence all the Psalms collected in the Psalter are regarded as songs of praise, even the lamentations which make up the bulk of the prayers. Appealing to the steadfast loving God for help has the effect of being touched by his saving love changing mourning to praising, putting a new song in our mouth, namely a song of praise (cf. 40,4). This could not be imagined without the theological power of חסד that has affected the Psalter in its entirety. Simultaneously, it has influenced the prophetic tradition, contributing a remarkable number of theological insights.

III. With Everlasting Love I Will Have Compassion on You: The Books of the Prophets

The tradition as given in the major and minor prophets originates from Israel's betrayal of the loving God. Prophetic writings would not exist if, in the course of the 8th century, God had not made the prophets announce the destruction of his people (cf. Amos 8,2). Moreover, prophetic writings would not have become an influential tradition if God had just executed the sentence of doom announced by the prophets without any mercy. Prophetic writings reflect God striving to maintain his love in view of Israel's betrayal. When he decides to execute the

sentence of doom, he does so as being inwardly torn apart by his inextinguishable love. Israel was told about this tension between doom and steadfast love within God's inner self by the prophets over and over again. The validity of the prophetic word was confirmed by continual updating within the growing prophetic writings that were acquiring a more and more authoritative character. Some aspects of this process will now be portrayed.

Hosea's prophetic existence is formed as an image of God's internal conflict between doom and love⁽²¹⁾. The prophet's children bear symbolic names, the daughter *לֹא רַחֵם* 'Not pitied' (Hos 1,6) and one of his sons *לֹא עַמִּי* 'Not my people' (1,9). Thus, they incorporate God's turning away from Israel which endangers Israel's life. Israel understood quite well that in case God withdrew his mercy, this would mean serious danger. Consequently, those writers who were handing down the tradition took pains to exempt Judah from God's merciless judgement (cf. 1,7) and to have the promise of God's new mercy (cf. 2,1-3), certainly presupposing the experience of his judgement. The promise given in Hos 2,3 makes unmistakably clear what the children's ominous names already suggested. When God revokes his mercy, God's relation with the Israelite people ceases to exist. 'Not my people' may still be taken as a people in the eyes of the world. Theologically speaking, they are less than nothing. Like a reflected image the names 'My people' and 'Pitied' occur in Hos 2,3. They indicate the future promise that Israel might be identified with these. Only where God's steadfast love for his people is realized as mercy is there a chance of life for Israel, namely living as sons of the living, that is, the life-giving God (cf. 2,1).

In the Book of Hosea, Israel's betrayal becomes the central theme dealt with in terms of love. In Hos 6,1-6⁽²²⁾ the people's willingness to

⁽²¹⁾ The introductory text Hos 1,2-2,3 (with respect to the development of the section and exegetical details cf. J. JEREMIAS, *Der Prophet Hosea* [ATD 24/1; Göttingen 1983] 24-36), part of the increasingly elaborated section Hos 1-3, provides a good example of how prophetic theology can be shaped as the prophet's biography (cf. B. SEIFERT, *Metaphorisches Reden von Gott im Hoseabuch* [FRLANT 166; Göttingen 1996] 92-138). Consequently, the text does not require a biographical but a theological evaluation.

⁽²²⁾ Concerning basic exegetical issues cf. JEREMIAS, *Hosea*, 78-89; H. SIMAN-YOFRE, *El Desierto de los Dioses*. Teología e Historia en el libro de Oseas (Córdoba 1992) 90-97. Development and intention of Hos 6,1-6 are a matter of debate that need not be resumed and settled here; cf. G.A. YEE, *Composition and Tradition in the Book of Hosea* (SBL.DS 102; Atlanta 1987) 174-179;

repent is compromised by their foolish belief in salvation that will come for certain. Israel's God may strike, but he does cure as well — that is as certain as the dawn and the showers. God's steadfast love — Hosea avoids this term in connection with God on purpose — is part of Israel's reckoning with salvation. Lamenting Israel's inability to love, God says: 'Your love (חסד) is like a morning cloud, like the dew that goes away early' (Hos 6,4b). There is no steadfast love on Israel's part. Israel does not comprehend the fatal presence of judgement which the prophetic word suggests (6,5a). Instead, they keep confiding without any reserve in God's benevolent presence. God, however, is waiting for mutual love and knowledge — in vain. Steadfast love (חסד) and knowledge of God (דעת אלהים) are intentionally combined in Hos 6,6. There is no blind love for God. There is only steadfast love combined with a listening heart, as the sages would put it (1 Kgs 3,9). Knowing God is loving and understanding at the same time. For sure, God will meet this with loving approval (חפצתי, Hos 6,6). There is only a gradual difference as compared to Ps 1, where the delight taken in the Torah (חפצו בחורח יורה) (1,2) leads the blissful man to the way of the righteous known by the loving God (cf. 1,6).

In the Book of Hosea God turns out to be incapable of executing judgement⁽²³⁾. He is repenting of his anger (Hos 11,8-9). 'What shall I do with you?' in Hos 6,4 is developed into 'How can I give you up!' in Hos 11,8. The reason for this is significant: 'for I am God and not man' (11,9b). God's being God means being capable of repenting of his just anger that he felt because of Israel's adultery. Upon what could God's repentance be based if not upon his steadfast love that turns out to be mercy? Consequently, one of the compositionally latest pronouncements in the Book of Hosea utters the promise:

And I will betroth you to me for ever; I will betroth you to me in righteousness and in justice (בצדק ובמשפט), in steadfast love and in mercy (בחסד וברחמים). I will betroth you to me in faithfulness (באמנה); and you shall know the Lord (Hos 2,21-22)⁽²⁴⁾.

W. WERNER, "Einige Anmerkungen zum Verständnis von Hos 6,1-6", "Wer ist wie du, HERR, unter den Göttern?" (FS. O. Kaiser [Hrsg. I. KOTTSIEPER et al.] Göttingen 1994) 355-372; R.G. KRATZ, "Erkenntnis Gottes im Hoseabuch", ZTK 94 (1997) 1-24, 7-13.

⁽²³⁾ Cf. M. KÖCKERT, "Prophetie und Geschichte im Hoseabuch", ZTK 85 (1988) 3-30, 26-30; SEIFERT, *Metaphorisches Reden*, 217-242.

⁽²⁴⁾ Cf. C. LEVIN, *Die Verheißung des neuen Bundes* (FRLANT 137; Göttingen 1985) 235-245.

This is a theological combination of two factors: that which is substantial for God and that which shall become reality for Israel. In the centre of the Torah (Exod 34,6) and throughout the Psalter the formula of grace tells us the same. The idea of God's expected re-betrothal to Israel in the Book of Hosea, however, includes the dimension of promise. It surpasses any preceding experience and — as other prophetic books do — transcends its own limits to gain a promising future. It is worth noticing that this occurs not only at the end of the book (Hos 14,2-9)⁽²⁵⁾, but in its first chapters. The position of the promise is even more prominent in the Septuagint where the twelve minor prophets are at the head of the prophetic writings, at least according to the tradition witnessed by Codex Vaticanus and Codex Alexandrinus. This is certainly due to the ancient chronology of the prophets. But maybe there was an additional reason for situating this book at the head of the prophetic canon, namely because it proclaims God's struggle for his betrayed love which is a struggle inside God himself (11,8-9) and a struggle between God and Israel (12,1-10)⁽²⁶⁾. God is victorious in the struggle, both against himself and against Israel. God's love as mercy is a new chance for Israel's future. This seems to be the pregnant starting point of prophecy in the Septuagint's arrangement.

How does prophecy come to an end in the Old Testament? Some theological hints will answer this question. They are based on several observations on how prophetic tradition came to be shaped into the form of books. Considering the importance of the Septuagint, we ought to direct our attention to the fact that it includes the apocalyptic Book of Daniel in the prophetic writings as the last book of the sequence. Thus, the Greek version emphasizes once again its characteristic concept of prophecy as intensely orientated towards the future. A similar tendency, however, is already present in the Hebrew version of the prophetic writings. This can be exemplified in the Books of Jeremiah and Deuteroisaiah. Both resume and carry on the prophecy of the Book of Hosea.

The first example is Jer 31, especially the section about the new covenant in 31,31-34⁽²⁷⁾. According to this passage God writes the

⁽²⁵⁾ Hos 14,5a: 'I will heal their faithlessness; I will love them freely' (אֶהְיֶה לָהֶם נְדָבָה).

⁽²⁶⁾ Cf. G. EIDEVALL, *Grapes in the Desert*. Metaphors, Models, and Themes in Hosea 4–14 (CB.OT 43; Stockholm 1996) 186-192; H. SPIECKERMANN, *Jakob und der Engel in Bibel und Kunst* (Zürich 1997) 35-51.

⁽²⁷⁾ Cf. the different exegetical approaches of LEVIN, *Verheißung*, 11-60, 132-146; W. GROB, "Neuer Bund oder Erneuerter Bund. Jer 31,31-34 in der jüngsten Diskussion", *Vorgeschmack*. Ökumenische Bemühungen um die Eucharistie (FS.

Torah on the Israelites' hearts, thus effecting immediate knowledge of God which men are incapable of achieving by themselves. God, however, makes them capable of it by planting the Torah into the hearts and combining it with an extensive forgiving of sin. Asking for the reason that may have induced God to this revival of his relation with Israel, the preceding passage unfolds the motif by referring to other prophetic writings and texts in the Old Testament. The intertextual dialogue with other, also still-developing books, proves Jer 31 — at least as a composition — to be a product of post-exilic times. The most important partners within this dialogue are the growing books of Hosea and Isaiah. In order to understand God's decision to establish a new covenant in Jer 31, the references in the Book of Hosea are most significant. The text Hos 2,16-22* talks about God's courting Israel again, about his covenant with animal creatures to Israel's benefit, and about his betrothal to Israel because of his loving mercy. In Jer 31,2-3 those Israelites who have escaped from the disaster in 587 rediscover God's favour (חן) in the wilderness and return into the land. They are guided by that God who again reveals himself and again offers a knowledge that Israel obviously had lost: 'I have loved you with an everlasting love (אֶדְרַבָּה עוֹלָם); therefore I have continued my faithfulness (חֶסֶד) to you' (31,3b). Whereas God strives for a new betrothal to Israel because of his love in Hos 2, he strives for the new covenant because of his love in Jer 31. Although it is the same love in Hosea and Jeremiah, eternal love in Jer 31,3 obviously has a different intensity. The new covenant is more than a new betrothal. Israel may again be an acceptable partner in the covenant because the new covenant reforms Israel herself. Knowledge of God becomes something immediate in Jer 31,34, as the Torah is right within the people's hearts⁽²⁸⁾. In Jer 31

T. Schneider [Hrsg. B. J. HILBERATH – D. SATTLER] Mainz 1995) 89-114; K. SCHMID, *Buchgestalten des Jeremiabuches*. Untersuchungen zur Redaktions- und Rezeptionsgeschichte von Jer 30–33 im Kontext des Buches (WMANT 72; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1996) 66-85, 107-196.

⁽²⁸⁾ Entering into intertextual dialogue with Hos 11,1-9 God poses himself once again the question in Jer 31,20, how things are about his relationship to his son Ephraim/Israel. God's speaking of his son in Jer 31,20 — dear son (בֶּן יֶקֶר) and darling child (יֶלֶד שֶׁשֶׁשֶׁיִּת) — emphasizes the language of love compared with Hos 11,1. God perceives rather astonished that his intention to blame his son turns out finally as his compassionate remembering his son. Whereas God pronounces in Hos 11,8-9 what he is determined to do to Ephraim/Israel, he communicates in Jer 31,20 his altered decisions and feelings towards his beloved son: remembering him in order to save him, yearning for him, having mercy on him.

God has not recreated everything, but something crucial — caused by his eternal love for Israel. Here, an immense hope is born.

The Septuagint situates the revival of God's eternal love in the last but one position within the prophetic book (Jer 38 LXX [Jer 31 MT] as part of the section Jer 37–42 LXX [Jer 30–35 MT]) followed by the story of Jeremiah's suffering which makes up the end of the prophet's book (43–51 LXX [36–45 MT]). Although the sequence of the sections is already the same in MT, the Greek version of Jeremiah emphasizes the unsettled tension between the promise and the prophet's suffering even more by situating the latter in the final position. The relation of promise and suffering remains unresolved.

The Book of Deuteroisaiah (Isa 40–55) theologically intensifies the relation of promising love and suffering. In this respect, two texts can be regarded as a theological climax: the fourth song of God's Servant in Isa 52,13–53,12⁽²⁹⁾ and the following passage in 54,1–10 which gives a promise to the woman Zion, a woman with a history, who is addressed by her divine husband⁽³⁰⁾. Both passages are referring to one another. In the central portion of the Servant's fourth song (Isa 53,1–11a α), a group says what the unidentified Servant's suffering means to them. Here, suffering does not only imply representation⁽³¹⁾, but substitution. What the Servant does is give up his life for others: 'But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities, upon him was the chastisement that made us whole, and with his stripes we are healed' (Isa 53,5). The possibility of taking fatal

⁽²⁹⁾ Cf. H.-J. HERMISSON, "Das vierte Gottesknechtslied im deuterojesajanischen Kontext", *Der leidende Gottesknecht. Jesaja 53 und seine Wirkungsgeschichte* (Hrsg. B. JANOWSKI – P. STUHLMACHER) (FAT 14; Tübingen 1996) 1–25; B. JANOWSKI, "Er trug unsere Sünden. Jes 53 und die Dramatik der Stellvertretung", *ZTK* 90 (1993) 1–24 (= *Der leidende Gottesknecht. Jesaja 53 und seine Wirkungsgeschichte* [Hrsg. B. JANOWSKI – P. STUHLMACHER] [FAT 14; Tübingen 1996] 27–48); H. SPIECKERMANN, "Konzeption und Vorgeschichte des Stellvertretungsgedankens im Alten Testament", *Congress Volume Cambridge 1995* (ed. J.A. EMERTON) (VTS 66; Leiden 1997) 281–295; ID., "Stellvertretung. Altes Testament", *TRE* 32 (forthcoming).

⁽³⁰⁾ Cf. O. H. STECK, "Beobachtungen zur Anlage von Jesaja 54,1–8", *ZAW* 101 (1989) 282–285 (= ID., *Gottesknecht und Zion* [FAT 4; Tübingen 1992] 92–95); ID., "Beobachtungen zu den Zion-Texten in Jesaja 51–54", *BN* 46 (1989) 58–90 (= ID., *Gottesknecht und Zion*, 96–125).

⁽³¹⁾ As it is the case in Jeremiah's confessions and with his sufferings. Both times, the prophet represents God's suffering at the hands of Israel as well as Israel's suffering due to her disobedience and, consequently, Israel's suffering at the hands of the nations.

suffering upon him (53,8) presupposes the Servant's sinlessness (53,9) and the conformity of his will with God's (53,6.10). In the verses framing the message of the group God himself confirms the effectivity of the Servant's suffering and death. Probably, it is even further expanded. In the final passage (53,11aβ-12), it is stressed thrice that the 'many' (רבים) profit by the Servant's suffering and death. Who these many are, is not defined here. But the fact that v. 12 parallelizes the many and the sinners (פושעים) seems to support the view that the many are regarded as a more numerous group than the one proclaiming the Servant's suffering. Finally, the introductory divine speech in 52,12-15 clarifies the understanding aimed at. Here, we discover a tendency to identify the many (52,14) with the many nations (גוים רבים) (52,15). The Servant's suffering has assumed universal meaning; it is a promise to the nations which originates from a deed already performed.

The close relation between God and the Servant conveyed by his suffering and death reaches the limits of theological imagination within the Old Testament⁽³²⁾. In the Book of Deuteroisaiiah, the Servant's fourth song is immediately followed by a text which replaces the relationship of God and the Servant by the relationship of man and woman representing the relationship between God and Zion-Israel. After betrayal and adultery, after sterility and widowhood — the images of sin and suffering overlap and permeate one another — God declares and promises his love to his wife Zion-Israel. This love need not be reanimated; it was always there. God could never give up his first love. 'Can a wife of a man's youth be cast off, says your God?'⁽³³⁾ For a brief moment I abandoned you, but with great compassion

⁽³²⁾ The substitution of the Servant's suffering and death effecting the salvation of the many touches the theological limits of the Old Testament as it is one of its fundamental presuppositions that God alone is able to rescue — nobody else. Men — kings and priests — can convey salvation by virtue of their special tasks, but certainly not by their own suffering and death. It is significant that the author of the Servant's fourth song does not attempt to combine the substitution by the Servant's suffering and death with God's love towards the many. Obviously, God's decision to accept the Servant's substitutive deed does not get beyond preliminary theological reflection. This is also true in respect of Isa 53,10. We are to understand that the Servant acts in complete accordance with God's will רצון. But what is the innermost motivation of God's will, and what does it aim at?

⁽³³⁾ The construction of Isa 54,6b is understood best as 'een irreële vraag of een uitroep van ongeloof' (W.A.M. BEUKEN, *Jesaja IIB* [De Prediking van het Oude Testament; Nijkerk 1983] 252; cf. F. BUHL, *Jesaja* [København – Kristiania 1913] 658).

(גדלים רחמים) I will gather you. In overflowing wrath for a moment I hid my face from you, but with everlasting love (חסד עולם) I will have compassion on you, says the Lord, your Redeemer (מרחם) (54,6b-8). Although this God is 'the God of the whole earth' (54,5b), his love is exclusively directed towards Israel, his first love. God's anger is not nearly stressed as much as his love. His love is not only great compassion, but 'my covenant of salvation' (ברית שלומי, 54,10). In the preceding verse (54,9), the Priestly Code's covenant between God and Noah (cf. Gen 9,8-17) is recalled. It was deliberately done in reference to the Servant's fourth song. As Noah's covenant is surpassed by the firm promise of merciful love, so the Servant's intercession is implicitly rejected by God's salvatory covenant. There are no mediators between God and Israel, either in the field of love or in that of sin.

Even more than MT the Septuagint has stylized the passage in Isa 54 as the canticle of divine mercy. To give only one example: מרחם in 54,10, an epithet of God that means 'who has compassion', is rendered by "Ιλεως, 'gracious', that sounds like ἔλεος, due to the itacism of Hellenistic Greek. There is no other explanation than the homophony of ἔλεος 'compassion' and "Ιλεως 'gracious'. God himself is the incarnation of compassion. However, it is left undecided in what way God's compassion may be realized in Israel, considering the guilt which is continually separating Israel from God. Furthermore, it is left undecided in what way the nations may find a position within God's intimate relation to Israel. The further time proceeds, the more the tension between the salvation of Israel and the judgement of the nations increases. But prophecy does not offer a final word about it.

IV. God's Steadfast Love in Jesus Christ: End and Abundance of the Law

From the New Testament witnesses' point of view the final word about this tension is the word of truth given in Jesus Christ. These witnesses themselves were Jews who lived on the words of their developing Jewish Bible, especially as represented by the Septuagint. After the glimpses just caught of the Old Testament tradition it is no wonder that they perceived Christ's coming as the answer to the words they found in their Jewish Bible, which became Christian thereafter. It may be left undecided which texts in the Septuagint were still used in a proper Jewish sense and which were already reinterpreted in a Christian sense. There is no doubt that even the Jewish version of the

Septuagint was a book suggestive of the belief in Christ. Otherwise the earliest Christians and the early church would not have appreciated it so much, and Hellenistic Judaism would not have abandoned it.

To give an example from the Septuagint. How should (still Jewish) witnesses who had come to believe in Christ understand their Greek Bible when they read Ps 135,1 LXX (136,1 MT): 'O give thanks to the Lord (τῷ κυρίῳ), for he is good (ὅτι χρηστός), for his mercy endures forever'. The κύριος is called χρηστός 'good, merciful'. As this term is a homophone of Χριστός in current Greek language of that time, the two words would be identified. This identification, found not only in Ps 135,1 LXX but also in 33,9 LXX (34,9 MT) and elsewhere, has been put into practice in 1 Pet 2,3. In the verses immediately following this identification, the great promises to Israel and God's beneficent actions are announced to those who have come to believe in Christ:

But you are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, God's own people, that you may declare the wonderful deeds of him who called you out of darkness into his marvellous light. Once you were no people, but now you are God's people; once you had not received mercy, but now you have received mercy (1 Pet 2,9-10).

Nearly every word within these lines and in the context subsists in Old Testament words. 'No people' that has become 'God's people' — an allusion to Hos 1-2 — is now understood as the nations, whose relationship with God had not been clearly defined in the Old Testament.

The mercy the nations experienced consists in Jesus Christ's suffering and death on behalf of all men's guilt. The idea of a singular sacrifice as a substitute on behalf of the many's guilt had been conceived in the Servant's fourth song, but it was not resumed within the Old Testament. Now, however, it gains significance. When St. Paul wants to present the essentials of Christian faith, he employs the already adopted tradition 'that Christ died for our sins in accordance with the scriptures, that he was buried, that he was raised on the third day in accordance with the scriptures' (1 Cor 15,3-4). This testimony can only be related to the just developing Jewish Bible. St. Paul does not quote certain texts as his testimony, but instead the authoritative writings as a whole are qualified as testimony. Nevertheless, there are allusions to possibly three passages: Isa 53, Hos 6,2 and Jonah 2,1. Theological perception is not dependent on textual quantities. Quite consciously he says 'in accordance with the scriptures', and not 'in accordance with several texts in the scriptures'. This is to perceive the

entire whole as such and at the same time to select parts from it on purpose. Looking at the Servant's fourth song from this point of view leads to the following conclusion. The idea of the Servant's suffering and death goes beyond the scope of the Old Testament, probably due to the fact that the Servant's relationship with God may have been suspected of affecting the monotheistic concept of the Old Testament. The Servant's fourth song carries the idea of his close relationship with God on even to the edge of the idea of God's incarnation in human flesh, although the song does not take this final step. God's incarnation in Jesus Christ is to effect the atonement of the many's guilt by his suffering and death. This divine action is the New Testament's centre. It was only possible to perceive this divine action, its necessity and possibility, through the writings that first developed into the Jewish and, later, the Christian Bible. Without these writings, not least the Servant's fourth song, it would have been impossible to understand this divine action as an action caused by love (cf. Rom 5,8; John 3,16). It is significant that God's mercy, which is a predominant motif in the more recent Old Testament documents, is largely replaced by God's love in the New Testament. God reconciling the world with himself through his beloved son (2 Cor 5,17-21) makes the loving relationship of the Father and the Son affect the world. According to the example of God's relationship to wisdom (cf. Wis 1,6; 7,22-8,1; 9-10) God's mercy takes the shape of love of humankind because God's love for his son and for the world are one and the same. Since Christians experience and perceive this in Christ's love they lead their lives gratefully receiving and passing on this love. This is now the way having the abundance of the law in their own lives (cf. Rom 13,8-10), although the law as a way of salvation has come to an end by Christ's suffering and death (cf. 10,4).

The New Testament does not conceal that interpretation is required in order to come to know God's love by Christ's love that gives a bright light into the hearts. The interpretation is based on the insight that it is God himself 'to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the Face of Christ' (2 Cor 4,6) into the believers' hearts. Any scholarly interpreter of the Christian Bible has to be aware of this presupposition. The story of the walk to Emmaus may serve as a good illustration of the specific perception offered by biblical hermeneutics. In Luke 24,13-35 the process of interpretation is taken as a communication with Jesus risen from the dead. It is he who becomes an interpreter to the two disciples before they can interpret things on their own: 'And beginning

with Moses and all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself' (24,27). Characteristically, the disciples perceive the truth of the interpretation only when Jesus gives the blessed bread to them (24,30-31.35). The experience of the true authenticity of his person has to join the interpretative words. Only after that the disciples may say from a retrospective point of view: 'Did not our hearts burn within us while he talked to us on the road, while he opened to us the scriptures?' (24,32). Interpreting as opening the scriptures requires eyes opened by Jesus Christ or God, respectively (24,31).

Every form of interpretation in Christian theology, even scholarly exegesis, is dependent on this. The scholarly exegete also principally directs his attention towards recognizing the truth inherent in the texts entrusted to him — although this fact is not always quite evident with all his philological and historical investigations. To discover the truth of the Christian Bible — including the Old Testament — does not mean to discover immediate testimony to Christ in Old Testament texts. This would be an attempt bound to fail. Interpreting the authentic testimony of the Christian Bible means to take investigation into the texts' world seriously. Neglecting the text's historical dimension results in docetism, whereas disregarding the question concerning the truth results in religious indifference. Biblical texts should be read critically and theologically, i.e. not with a slow heart (Luke 24,25), but with a burning heart (cf. 24,32) instead. From the New Testament point of view, it is God incarnate in Jesus Christ, who sets the heart burning. He opens the scriptures (cf. 24,32), namely the Old Testament, by interpreting all scriptures (cf. 24,27) with regard to himself. This is not exegetic monomania that discovers always the same in any text. Jesus Christ being God incarnate involves himself in the texts and thus teaches to ask for God in accordance with truth. In the story of the walk to Emmaus Jesus asks the question as to suffering in accordance with truth. Everyone who reads the story about Jeremiah's suffering or the Servant's fourth song with such open eyes will perceive the tension between divine love, prophetic suffering and human sin developing in the Old Testament. Asking questions in accordance with truth perceived in the Christian Bible leads to the realization that the Servant's intercession by suffering and death on behalf of the sinful many comes very close to the idea of God's incarnation in the Servant, although this final step is not taken there. Thus, in spite of the Servant's suffering substituting for the many there is no theological re-orientation in the

Old Testament leading to a fundamental identification of the Servant's suffering with God's nature and self-determination towards love and mercy.

Asking questions in accordance with truth on the basis of the Christian Bible means perceiving God's steadfast love illuminated by his incarnation in Jesus Christ as the leitmotif of all scriptures. It is the task of a Christian Bible's theology — and of an Old Testament theology being a part of it — to pay attention to this theme in the manifold forms and situations witnessed in the scriptures. It is by no means the only way to write an Old Testament theology on the basis of the Christian Bible, but it is an appropriate way to establish a fruitful synthesis of a burning heart and a critical mind formed by exegetical erudition.

Georg-August-Universität Göttingen Hermann SPIECKERMANN
Theologische Fakultät
Platz der Göttinger Sieben 2
D-37073 Göttingen

SUMMARY

This article argues in favour of a conception of Old Testament theology that is aware of the different hermeneutical presuppositions due to the different canonical shapes of the Jewish and the Christian Bible, respectively. An Old Testament Theology based on the canon of the Christian Bible has to do equal justice to the Hebrew and to the Greek version of the Old Testament, acknowledging that the Greek version, the Septuagint, is a dominant factor for the emergence of Christian faith. Perceiving the Old Testament from a Christian point of view sheds new light on a central theological issue thus far underestimated in scholarly research: God's steadfast love. The contribution tries to show how this characteristic insight into God's true being is reflected and interpreted in the different parts of the Old Testament.

How Does Luke Portray Jesus as Servant of YHWH

Some scholars point out that a study of Luke's christology which limits itself to the titles applied to Jesus necessarily has its lacunae⁽¹⁾, and in this they are surely correct. On the other hand, a consideration of any of these titles can potentially offer insights into how Luke portrayed his christology. Nor should the Lucan titles be reduced to one or two of them; rather the titles are similar in that they all refer to the same person, Jesus, and so are naturally associated with one another. However, each time a title occurs, it needs to be studied in its context to see what nuance it carries and thus how Luke may have employed it to develop his christology. This article will reflect on one of these titles, Servant of YHWH⁽²⁾, about whose significance scholars are far from agreement; in their understanding of Luke's treatment of Jesus as Servant of YHWH, some even doubt that there is enough data to say that the theme belongs to Luke's christology. Here a case will be made for the opposite opinion, and a claim made about Luke's meaning of this title.

Naturally, a study of the topic must address a number of questions. Although most of Luke's references to Jesus as this servant do refer to one of the Servant of YHWH hymns⁽³⁾, how many of the other Isaian passages, predicated of Jesus, did Luke regard as falling under this

(¹) For instance, H. CONZELMANN, *The Theology of Luke* (New York 1961) 170, 172, 179, claims that Luke is no longer aware of the original peculiarities of titles such as 'Son of Man', etc., that Jesus the prophet, the holy one, the righteous one and the $\pi\alpha\iota\varsigma$ have become traditional and in Luke's view have the same meaning as the other titles, Christ and Lord, and that in the use of titles Luke makes no distinction between the historical and the Exalted Christ. However, Conzelmann's interpretation does not square well with Luke's knowledge of the LXX nor with his actual use of the titles.

(²) The title, 'Servant of YHWH', seems to be more prevalent than 'Suffering Servant', although either expression applies to Jesus.

(³) Isa 42,1-7; 49,1-9a; 50,4-11; 52,13-53,12; not all scholars would agree on the verses belonging to the first two hymns. Of course, neither the NT nor Luke limits use of the Servant of YHWH hymns to Jesus. Paul sees himself as the servant (Gal 1,15-16 [cf. Isa 42,6; 49,1.6]; 2 Cor 6,1-2 [cf. Isa 49,8]; Rom 15,20-21 [Isa 52,15]); and Luke portrays Christians as carrying out Jesus' ministry as the Servant, e.g., Paul and Barnabas (Acts 13,46-47; cf. Isa 49,6) and Paul himself (Acts 26,18; cf. Isa 42,7; 61,1).

theme⁽⁴⁾? Furthermore, how many of these references are unique to Luke? Also, although some of Luke's references to Jesus as Servant of YHWH are obvious, others are subtler; and it must be demonstrated that each of these passages is probably such a reference. For instance, this last observation is relevant as regards what interpretation should be given to παραδίδωμι, 'I hand over', and ἄγω, 'I lead', and the cognates of the latter. Do these verbs also serve Luke to picture Jesus as the Servant of YHWH? Moreover, what is Luke's word-pattern for his presentation of Jesus as the Servant of YHWH? According to the present interpretation, this pattern would have to include the following vocabulary, ἄγω, ἐκλεκτός, 'elect', and cognates, παῖς, 'servant', παραδίδωμι, σωτηρία, 'salvation', and φῶς ἐθνῶν, 'light of the Gentiles'. Nonetheless, our best approach to the question expressed in the title of this article is to begin with a study of those passages in which Luke most probably views Jesus as the Servant of YHWH or as acting as the Servant acted.

I. Luke Viewed Jesus' Death as That of the Servant of YHWH⁽⁵⁾

Let us begin our consideration here with Acts 8,32-33 (cf. Isa 53,7-8 LXX)⁽⁶⁾ because that passage leaves no doubt that Luke uses this description of the Servant to summarize how he presents Jesus in his passion narrative⁽⁷⁾:

ἡ δὲ περιοχὴ τῆς γραφῆς ἣν ἀνεγίνωσκεν ἦν αὕτη· Ὡς πρόβατον ἐπὶ σφαγὴν ἤχθη καὶ ὡς ἀμνὸς ἐναντίον τοῦ κείραντος αὐτὸν ἄφωνος, οὕτως οὐκ ἀνοίγει τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ. Ἐν τῇ ταπεινώσει [αὐτοῦ] ἡ κρίσις αὐτοῦ ἤρθη· τὴν γενεάν αὐτοῦ τίς διηγῆσεται; ὅτι αἴρεται ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἡ ζωὴ αὐτοῦ

⁽⁴⁾ Other passages from Isaiah which Luke uses and probably were attributed by him to the theme of Servant of YHWH would be Isa 35,5; 40,5 (LXX); 50,7 (LXX) (?); 58,6; 60,1-3; 61,1-2.

⁽⁵⁾ On this point see A. GEORGE, "Le sens de la mort de Jésus pour Luc", *RB* 80 (1973) 186-217; J.B. GREEN, "The Death of Jesus, God's Servant", *Reimaging the Death of the Lukan Jesus* (ed. D.D. SYLVA) (BBB 73; Frankfurt a. Main 1990) 18-28. Green's article is particularly relevant.

⁽⁶⁾ Up to the present, no one has convincingly demonstrated that Luke knew Hebrew; and his OT references are to the LXX. However, the possibility remains that some Lucan texts were formed by earlier church tradition and based on the MT. Of course, some references to the Servant of YHWH could be Luke's own phrasing.

⁽⁷⁾ Confer M. KORN, *Die Geschichte Jesu in veränderter Zeit* (WUNT 2/51; Tübingen 1993) 254-257 and I.H. MARSHALL, *Luke, Historian and Theologian* (Grand Rapids 1989) 171-173.

This was the passage of Scripture he was reading: 'Like a sheep he was led to the slaughter, like a lamb before its shearer he was silent and opened not his mouth. In his humiliation he was deprived of justice. Who will ever speak of his posterity, for his life was taken from earth' (*).

The Ethiopian eunuch is reading this passage and asks Philip about whom the prophet was speaking; beginning with this passage, Philip proclaims to him Jesus. We find in Acts 8,32-33 clear references to Jesus' passion, 'As a sheep led to the slaughter', unjust trial and 'his life was taken from the earth'. Moreover, since Luke elsewhere calls Jesus *παῖς* (Acts 3,13.26; 4,27.30) and, as we shall see, elsewhere makes other references to Isa 52,13-53,12, it is reasonable to conclude that in citing vv. 7-8 of this chapter he wanted to identify Jesus as the Servant who carried out the mission assigned to him. The citation of the scripture passage locates these happenings within God's providence and also comments on Jesus' comportment during the passion; he is meek and humble and does not speak. Nevertheless, he still did not get a fair trial, nor was there any reason to think that someone would care enough to record his memory.

This understanding of Acts 8,32-33 as bearing on Jesus' passion is confirmed by one of the passion predictions and by four Servant of YHWH references which occur during Luke's passion narrative. The third passion prediction, Luke 18,32-33b, in the Greek reads:

παραδοθήσεται γὰρ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν καὶ ἐμπαιχθήσεται καὶ ὕβρισθήσεται καὶ ἐμπτυσθήσεται καὶ μαστιγώσαντες ἀποκτενοῦσιν αὐτόν

He will be delivered up to the Gentiles. He will be mocked and outraged and spat upon. They will scourge him and put him to death,

and contains two expressions similar to those found about the Servant's suffering in Isa 50,6:

τὸν νῶτόν μου δέδωκα εἰς μάστιγας ... τὸ δὲ πρόσωπόν μου οὐκ ἀπέστρεψα ἀπὸ αἰσχύνῃς ἐμπτυσμάτων

I gave my back to the scourging ... and I did not turn my face from the shame of the spittle,

and so suggests that Luke sees Jesus' suffering as similar to that of the Servant. During the Last Supper discourse Jesus claims that

λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι τοῦτο τὸ γεγραμμένον δεῖ τελεσθῆναι ἐν ἐμοί, τὸ καὶ μετὰ ἀνόμων ἐλογίσθη· καὶ γὰρ τὸ περὶ ἐμοῦ τέλος ἔχει

(*) This article will follow the translation of *The New American Bible* (Wichita 1983), unless for some reason it is not judged to be precise; then the translation is my own.

It is written in Scripture, 'He was counted among the wicked', and this I tell you, must come to be fulfilled in me; all that is (written) about me has its fulfillment (Luke 22,37; cf. Isa 53,12)

will come to pass in his regard. Again we have a reference to the Servant passages, Isa 53; and the citation, δεῖ and the predicted fulfillment (τελεσθῆναι, τέλος ἔχει) all point to Jesus' being associated with criminals as being God's will. Later in the garden this association is confirmed; for Jesus says to the high priests, elders and temple soldiers that they came out armed with swords and clubs as against a thief: 'Ὡς ἐπὶ ληστήν ἐξήλθατε (Luke 22,52). Actually, Jesus is crucified with two criminals (23,32-33; cf. vv. 39-43)⁽⁹⁾. The officials' mockery, noted above, includes the designation of Jesus as ὁ ἐκλεκτός (23,35, 'the chosen one'; cf. Isa 42,1) and marks the second Servant of YHWH reference during the passion. A further reference to Jesus as the Servant of YHWH lies in Jesus' not answering a word to Herod's questions (Luke 23,9; cf. Acts 8,32; Isa 53,7). So, Jesus' being numbered among criminals surely was a fact; but it stands in stark contrast to his personal comportment.

A final reference to Jesus as the Servant of YHWH occurs a number of times during Luke's passion narrative. A number of scholars contend that Luke presents Jesus' passion as the martyrdom of a just man⁽¹⁰⁾. This statement is true, but is the more generic identification of a literary form. Luke is more specific than this. His own explanation of what he has done occurs in Acts 8,32-35 and is particularly evident in his many declarations of Jesus' innocence which should be connected with the Lukan portrayal of him as Servant of YHWH. Isa 53,9 reads of the servant:

ὅτι ἀνομίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν, οὐδὲ εὐρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ

(cf. Isa 50,9: יהוה יעזרלי מידווא ירשיעי).

The previous verse (53,8; cf. Acts 8,33) had already begun to introduce the notion of innocence; for it states:

⁽⁹⁾ For a consideration of the influence of Luke 22,37 on the context of the latter passage, see M. RESE, *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas* (Götersloh 1969) 155-160.

⁽¹⁰⁾ During the course of the passion Luke has likewise either explicitly or implicitly and through irony, identified Jesus as the Christ (Luke 22,67-69; 23,2.35), king (23,2.3.37-38; cf. 22,16.18.29-30.69) and Son of God (22,70-71; cf. 23,34.46). No one title or statement suffices to express fully who Jesus is; but the Servant of YHWH tradition helps Luke explain the reality and shock of Jesus' passion.

Ἐν τῇ ταπεινώσει [αὐτοῦ] ἡ κρίσις αὐτοῦ ἦρθη· τὴν γενεάν αὐτοῦ τίς διηγῆσεται

i.e., Jesus did not get a fair trial. Furthermore, Isa 53,11 asserts that God will, 'justify the just one (δίκαιον) who serves many well'. Luke has definitely portrayed Jesus as innocent during the passion. Pilate says that he finds no guilt in Jesus (Luke 23,4) and in a threefold manner repeats this conviction when he reports that neither has Herod found any charge worthy of death in him (vv. 14-15). Pilate then again a third time states Jesus' innocence (v. 22). The good thief also affirms that Jesus has done nothing amiss (v. 41). In more solemn fashion, the centurion glorifies God and asserts of Jesus, 'Truly this was a just man' (v. 47) while the other Synoptics have 'Truly, this man was Son of God' (cf. Mark 15,39; Matt 27,54); and if the beating of one's breast means an individual knows that he has participated in an evil action, we would have still another statement of Jesus' innocence when the crowd leaves the crucifixion beating their breasts (cf. Luke 23,48).

The theme of Jesus' innocence also appears in Acts. In his speech in Solomon's Portico, Peter claims that his audience had demanded that a murderer be freed and denied the holy and just one (δίκαιον) and so killed the author of life, even though Pilate had judged he should be freed (Acts 3,13-15). Subsequently, Stephen concludes his speech with the accusation that the members of his audience are the betrayers and murders of the just one (δικαίου; cf. 7,52). These latter expressions are similar to the words of the centurion at the crucifixion who proclaimed Jesus' innocence with the words Ὁντως ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος δίκαιος ἦν (Luke 23,47). Finally, Paul at Antioch of Pisidia explains that the inhabitants of Jerusalem and their rulers, ignorant of the message of the prophets, even though they found no crime in Jesus worthy of death, still demanded his execution and so fulfilled what the scriptures said (13,27-29). This extensive theme of Jesus' innocence is later matched by that of Paul in Acts⁽¹¹⁾, and both portrayals relate to the Lukan presentation of Jesus as Servant of YHWH.

1. Acts 4,27

There is reason to think that Luke also intends to refer to Jesus as the Servant of YHWH in Acts 4,27⁽¹²⁾. It is true that 4,25 (cf. Luke 1,69)

⁽¹¹⁾ See Acts 23,9,29; 24,18-20; 25,7-11,18,25a; 26,31-32; 28,17-19.

⁽¹²⁾ See J.J. KILGALLAN, "Your Servant Jesus Whom You Anointed (Acts 4,27)", *RB* 105 (1998) 185-201.

speak of David as παιδός σου 'your servant', and this fact would naturally lead one to conclude that παῖς is used two verses later of Jesus because he is David's descendant. Moreover, v. 27 also says of Jesus ὃν ἔχρισας ('whom you anointed'); and thus identifies him with the Christ of the Lord of v.26. However, the context (vv. 25-27; cf. Ps 2,1-2) also speaks of the opposition to the Lord and his Christ and so well agrees with Luke's use of the figure of the Servant of YHWH to explain Jesus' passion.

Moreover, few authors doubt that in the previous chapter (Acts 3,13.26) Luke does write of Jesus as the Servant of YHWH; and we will see that in the programmatic passage (Luke 4,14-44), which parallels the thought of Acts 4,26-27, Jesus is most likely not to be seen only as a prophet but also as the Servant of YHWH and the Christ. So, Luke may well have joined these last two identifications of Jesus when he composed Acts 4,26-30 (cf. vv. 23-31).

Acts 3,13-15 support the above understanding of 8,32-33 (and of 4,27); for as we shall see below, the sentence, 'The God ... glorified his servant Jesus' (3,13), looks to Isa 52,13 and to Jesus' resurrection. First I note that immediately following this phrase in Acts 3,13-15a we find:

ὃν ὑμεῖς μὲν παρεδώκατε καὶ ἡρνήσασθε κατὰ πρόσωπον Πιλάτου, κρίναντος ἐκείνου ἀπολύειν· ὑμεῖς δὲ τὸν ἅγιον καὶ δίκαιον ἡρνήσασθε ... τὸν δὲ ἀρχηγὸν τῆς ζωῆς ἀπεκτείνετε

Whom you handed over and disowned in Pilate's presence when Pilate was ready to release him; you rejected the Holy and Just One ... put to death the author of life.

These verses support this article's interpretation of Acts 8,32-33. There is the obvious reference to the Servant of YHWH hymn and the designation of Jesus as servant (cf. Isa 52,13). Moreover, we will contend below that παραδίδομι, 'I hand over', belongs to the word-pattern of this title. Also the adjective, δίκαιος, 'just', appears in Isa 53,11 (δικαιῶσαι δίκαιον εἰς δουλεύοντα πολλοῖς, 'to justify the just one who serves many well') and so in the context which speaks of the servant's glorification. In addition, it was demonstrated above that δίκαιος is associated with Jesus' innocence, another aspect of Jesus as Servant of YHWH theme. Since the contents of Acts 3,13-15 resembles that of 8,32-33, the former passage supports the interpretation that the latter provides a summary of Luke's portrayal of Jesus as Servant of YHWH during the passion⁽¹³⁾.

(13) Coming at things from a different angle, J.A. FITZMYER, *The Gospel*

2. Παραδίδωμι

We are now ready to look at other data in or associated with the passion narrative, namely, παραδίδωμι and ἄγω, 'I lead', and its cognates which support the argument that Luke in these scenes intends to present Jesus as the Servant of YHWH. M.D. Hooker in agreement with F. Jackson and K. Lake writes, 'It is hard to see what other word the writers could naturally have used. It seems far more likely that παραδίδωμι was used as the most natural word, though probably it afterwards did much to strengthen the Christian interpretation of Isaiah when the coincidence in language was noted' ⁽¹⁴⁾. Nevertheless, παραδίδωμι does appear to belong to the word-pattern of Luke's presentation of Jesus as Servant of YHWH ⁽¹⁵⁾. This conclusion flows from Luke's own statement that he so views Jesus during the passion and from his portrayal of this conviction seen thus far, and from two passages from Isaiah:

πάντες ὡς πρόβατα ἐπλανήθημεν, ἄνθρωπος τῇ ὁδῷ αὐτοῦ ἐπλανήθη·
καὶ κύριος παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἡμῶν

We have all gone astray like sheep, each deceived in his own way; but the Lord handed him over for our sins (Isa 53,6);

διὰ τοῦτο αὐτὸς κληρονομήσει πολλοὺς καὶ τῶν ἰσχυρῶν μεριεῖ
σκῦλα, ἄνθ' ὧν παρεδόθη εἰς θάνατον ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐν τοῖς
ἀνόμοις ἐλογίσθη· καὶ αὐτὸς ἁμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνήνεγκεν καὶ διὰ τὰς
ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν παρεδόθη

Therefore, he will inherit many people and divide the spoils of the powerful because he was handed over to death and counted among criminals. He bore the sins of many, and for their sins was handed over (Isa 53,12).

Of course, we have already seen that this last verse (where παραδίδωμι occurs twice) was applied only by Luke to Jesus in the sense that he was to be numbered with criminals (cf. Luke 22,37).

In fact, παραδίδωμι actually appears fairly often in reference to Jesus' passion. According to the second passion prediction, the Son of Man is to be *handed over* into the hands of men (Luke 9,44); in the

According to Luke (I-IX) (AB 28A; Garden City 1981) 212, contends that the suffering predicated of the Son of Man comes from the Servant of YHWH tradition.

⁽¹⁴⁾ M.D. HOOKER, *Jesus and the Servant*. The Influence of the Servant Concept of Deutero-Isaiah in the NT (London 1959) 80. Unlike the present one, Hooker's approach is historical.

⁽¹⁵⁾ Confer F. HAHN, *The Titles of Jesus in Christology* (New York 1969) 59-61, who sees Isaiah as the source for Luke's use of παραδίδωμι.

third, he is to be *handed over* into the hands of the Gentiles (18,32). Later the scribes and high priests send some self-righteous individuals to trap Jesus in what he says so that they *can hand him over* to the procurator (20,20). Judas plots to *hand him over* and seeks an opportune moment to do so (22,4.6), and at the Last Supper Jesus shows that he is aware of who *will hand him over* and predicts that man's future (vv. 21-22). Later in the garden, Jesus asks Judas if he is *handing him over* with a kiss (v. 48). Pilate *hands Jesus over* to the will of his opponents (23,25). The two men at the tomb tell the women to remember what Jesus had predicted while he was with them in Galilee that the Son of Man had to be *handed over* into the hands of sinful men, be crucified and rise on the third day (24,6-7; cf. Acts 2,23). The two disciples on the road to Emmaus explain how the high priests and rulers had *handed Jesus over* to death (24,20); and above we noted that Acts 3,13 speaks of Jesus as servant but also accuses the Jewish audience of *handing him over*. Hence, although παραδίδωμι is the natural word to use for the 'handing over' of Jesus, its use about the Servant of YHWH in Isaiah and Luke's presentation of Jesus like this Servant during his passion as well as Luke's own association of παραδίδωμι with Jesus, so identified, suggests that this word belongs to the Lucan word-pattern of Jesus as Servant of YHWH, brings out his rejection and, given the references to Isaiah, reveals that what happened was foreseen to be God's will. One might object that in Isaiah the Lord hands over the servant while in Luke this is done by human agents; but in the latter situation it is ultimately God's providence which permits this human act.

Here we should address the question of what weight to attribute to Luke 22,19, 'This is my body *given* (διδόμενον) *for you*', the words in italics here were added by Luke himself, probably in imitation of 'poured out (ἐκχυννόμενον) for you' (v. 20) predicated of the cup. The latter phrasing finds a parallel in both of the other Synoptics (cf. Mark 14,24; Matt 26,28) and according to most authors represents the vicarious suffering of the Servant of YHWH (cf. Isa 53,4-6.11-12). Surely, Luke has taken over this traditional expression of vicarious suffering and expanded on it with 'given for you'. Nonetheless, he does not integrate the Pauline understanding of Jesus' death as redemptive into his own christology⁽¹⁶⁾; and probably for Luke διδόμενον also

⁽¹⁶⁾ E. LOHSE, *Märtyrer und Gottesknecht*. Untersuchungen zur urchristlichen Verkündigung vom Sühntod Jesu Christi (FRLANT 46; Göttingen 1955) 187-

carries the nuance of παραδίδομι, which word actually occurs twice in two verses almost immediately following (Luke 22,21-22). It was God's will (permissive) that Jesus be handed over to his suffering. Consequently, διδόμενον would constitute part of Luke's portrayal of Jesus as the Servant of YHWH and make the additional point that Jesus himself accepted his Father's will.

The only other passage in Luke-Acts where Jesus' redemptive death occurs is Acts 20,28 when Paul in his farewell speech to the Ephesian elders speaks of God's church 'redeemed through the blood of his own son'. Apparently, Luke in Paul's farewell speech and in the traditional material of the Last Supper (Luke 22,19-20) was willing to take over these statements of vicarious suffering and redemptive death. However, we find no clear additional evidence that Luke wanted to integrate vicarious suffering or a redemptive death into his own christology.

3. Ἄγω and Its Cognates

Ἄγω and its cognates also very likely belong to the word-pattern of Luke's portrayal of Jesus as Servant of YHWH. In Acts 8,32 (cf. Isa 53,7), Jesus is led as a lamb to the slaughter; and although not cited in its entirety in Acts 8,33, Isa 53,8 concludes with the words:

ὅτι αἴρεται ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἡ ζωὴ αὐτοῦ, ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνομιῶν τοῦ λαοῦ μου ἤχθη εἰς θάνατον

Because his life was taken from earth and he was led to death for the iniquities of my people.

Naturally, one could again bring up the consideration of M.D. Hooker and ask what other word would Luke have been able to use, and our response would have to be much like the one given for παραδίδομι. In fact, during the passion, Jesus' captors *led* him into the house of the high priest (Luke 22,54, εἰσάγω) and later before the Sanhedrin (v. 66, ἀπάγω). Then the whole crowd *leads* him before Pilate (23,1), and finally they *led* him away to crucify him (23,26, ἀπάγω). These

191. In his citation of Isa 53,7-8 (cf. Acts 8,32-33) Luke leaves off the end, ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνομιῶν τοῦ λαοῦ μου ἤχθη εἰς θάνατον, which could be rendered 'because of the iniquities of my people he was led to death'; and at the Last Supper the citation of Isa 53,12 (cf. Luke 22,37), does not include what immediately follows in the LXX, 'and he bore the sins of many and was delivered because of their iniquities'. Nor does Luke cite any other Isaian passage which speak of vicarious suffering (e.g., 53,4-6.11). See also RESE, *Alttestamentliche Motive*, 98-99.

examples apparently flow from Luke's desire to picture Jesus as the Servant of YHWH. It may be that the hostile action of the Jewish audience at Nazareth, *leading* Jesus to the brow of the hill in order to throw him off (Luke 4,29), should be included here since it stands in the programmatic passage which probably portrays Jesus as Servant of YHWH and so would be a foreshadowing of his passion.

4. *Luke 22,24-27*

What we have said thus far about Luke's passion story leads us to ask whether Luke 22,24-27 (cf. 9,45; Mark 10,42-45) should be considered part of Luke's portrayal of Jesus as the Servant of YHWH. Of the Synoptics, only Luke has introduced into the Last Supper scene the argument over who of the disciples is the greatest. Although we find no verbal connection between Jesus' response to this argument and Acts 8,32-33, Luke probably viewed the two descriptions as similar. In Luke 22,24-27 Jesus warns against being like the kings of the Gentiles who lord it over their subjects and make their power felt and who like being called benefactors. This is not to be the conduct of the Christian disciple; for the older among them should act as the younger, and the leader as the servant. In fact, διακονῶν, 'serving', occurs three times in these verses; and is developed by the reflection that it is true that the one who reclines at table is greater than the one who serves, but Jesus is among them as the one who serves. Jesus' humility and attitude of service resemble the thought of Acts 8,32-33, his being led as a sheep to the slaughter, a lamb to be sheared, silent and not opening his mouth, humble; yet there is no fair trial nor will he be remembered in history. The possible resemblance between Luke 22,24-27 and Acts 8,32-33 finds further support in the context of the former, the Last Supper scene; more specifically, these verses stand between two statements about Jesus' suffering and are preceded by the woe for him by whom Jesus is betrayed (παράδοται) (cf. Luke 22,21-23.28). So, Jesus' service includes his suffering. We also read in the context, 'This is my body given (διδόμενον) for you' and of the cup 'poured out (ἐκχυννόμενον) for you' (cf. Luke 22,19-20). These words likewise look to Jesus' passion and would describe Jesus' service. To be sure, the evidence is not strong; but it appears that by inserting the argument about who is greatest, Luke has introduced into his Last Supper scene a reflection similar to that found in Acts 8,32-33; and in this sense, Luke 22,24-27 would belong to Luke's portrayal of Jesus as Servant of YHWH. On the other hand, we note here, too, that, although Luke has

apparently taken over some of the thought of Mark 10,45 (Jesus' coming to serve), he does not do this as regards Mark's words which speak of vicarious suffering, δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν ἀντὶ τοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν ('To give his life in ransom for the many').

II. Some Servant of YHWH Passages Describe Jesus' Whole Ministry

The passages of interest here are Luke 2,29-32; 4,18-19; Acts 13,47; 26,23 (cf. Luke 2,25-35; 3,22; 4,14-44; 7,21-23; Acts 26,16-18; 28,28 [?]). In the *Nunc Dimittis*, Jesus is not identified as the Servant of YHWH; but a general description of his mission is provided which is based on that of the servant, who is to bring salvation, imaged as 'light' ⁽¹⁷⁾, also to the Gentiles (cf. Isa 42,6-7a [see also 60,1-3 ⁽¹⁸⁾]):

ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἐκάλεσά σε ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ κρατήσω τῆς χειρὸς σου καὶ ἐνισχύσω σε καὶ ἔδωκά σε εἰς διαθήκην γένους εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν ἀνοίχαι ὀφθαλμοὺς τυφλῶν

I, the Lord God, called you in righteousness and will take you by the hand and strengthen you; I gave you as a covenant of the people for a light to the Gentiles to open the eyes of the blind.

The thought of Luke 2,30-32, that Jesus brings salvation, imaged as 'light', to both Jews and Gentiles, is partially repeated in Acts 13,47 Τέθεικά σε εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν τοῦ εἶναί σε εἰς σωτηρίαν ἕως ἑσχάτου τῆς γῆς, ('I have set you to be a light for the Gentiles, so that you may bring salvation to the ends of the earth' ⁽¹⁹⁾) where Luke explicitly cites a similar passage, Isa 49,6 and the σε does not refer to either Paul or Barnabas but to Jesus whose agents they are ⁽²⁰⁾. Of course, the last

⁽¹⁷⁾ (Pace) KORN, *Die Geschichte Jesu*, 51-52,159 and G. VOSS, *Die Christologie der lukanischen Schriften in Grundzügen* (SN 2; Paris 1965) 167-168, 'light' for Luke does not refer primarily to preaching, but to the salvation Jesus brings.

⁽¹⁸⁾ RESE, *Alttestamentliche Motive* 184, discusses the probable OT influence on Luke 2,32 but makes no mention of Isa 60,1-3.

⁽¹⁹⁾ See P. GRELOT, "Note sur Actes XIII 47", *RB* 88 (1981) 368-372, on this verse.

⁽²⁰⁾ B.J. KOET, *Five Studies on Interpretation of Scriptures in Luke-Acts* (Leuven 1989) 110-114, provides a summary of the various interpretations of σε in this verse. However, Koet's claim that the reference looks also to the Jewish audience conflicts with the actual context that speaks of Jesus' and then Paul and Barnabas' mission which at that moment is not being accepted by their Jewish audience.

fours words of this citation of Acts 13,47 played a part in the description of the mission in the programmatic Acts 1,8. Luke returns to the theme of 'light' but also asserts that Jesus must suffer in Acts 26,23 (cf v. 18) where he quotes Paul as proclaiming:

εἰ παθητὸς ὁ Χριστός, εἰ πρῶτος ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν φῶς μέλλει καταγγέλλειν τῷ τε λαῷ καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν

that the Christ must suffer, and that first to rise from the dead he must proclaim light to the people and to the Gentiles.

Thus, according to Luke, Jesus through Paul (cf v. 18) actualizes the mission of the Servant of YHWH who brings salvation, 'light', to the people and to the Gentiles, but will be rejected and must suffer. In this way, Luke can justify Jesus' Gentile mission and his passion, yet contend that this mission is universal, for both Gentiles and Jews.

Elsewhere, I have indicated why a number of scholars contend that Luke is also presenting Jesus as the Servant of YHWH in Luke 4,18-19 (cf. vv. 16-30)⁽²¹⁾. The main arguments for this contention are: (1) the citations in these verses are taken from Isaiah (61,1-2 and 58,6); and the phrase, 'The Spirit of the Lord is upon me' is quite similar to that found in the first Servant Hymn (Isa 42,1: ἔδωκα τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπ' αὐτόν, 'I put my spirit on him'), and the ideas of Isa 42,7 (cf 49,9):

ἀνοῖξαι ὀφθαλμοὺς τυφλῶν ἐξαγαγεῖν ἐκ δεσμῶν δεδεμένους καὶ ἐξ οἴκου φυλακῆς καθημένους ἐν σκότει

To open the eyes of the blind, to lead prisoners from the dungeons and from the prison those who sit in darkness

resembles those of Luke 4,18; (2) Luke 2,25-35 constitutes a parallel to 4,16-30 and both passages speak of the salvation ('light' in 2,32 corresponds well with 'sight to the blind' in 4,19) which Jesus will bring, but we have demonstrated that the former passage describes Jesus' mission like that of the Servant; (3) Jesus' baptism (3,21-22) likewise constitutes a parallel to 4,18-19⁽²²⁾, and the phrase, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα, 'in you I was well-pleased', is a reference to the servant; cf. Isa 42,1:

⁽²¹⁾ "Does Luke Also Portray Jesus as the Christ in Luke 4,16-30?" *Bib* 76 (1995) 498-522; see also KOET, *Five Studies*, 32, 51, and MARSHALL, *Luke, Historian and Theologian*, 119, 127-128.

⁽²²⁾ KORN's, *Die Geschichte Jesu*, 66, contention that 'anointed me' (Luke 4,18) is best clarified by Luke 1,32-35 fails to appreciate that v. 35 of the latter passage is speaking about the unique relationship between God and the child Jesus, not about Jesus' mission.

LXX: Ἰακωβ ὁ παῖς μου ἀντιλήμψομαι αὐτοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου
προσεδέξατο αὐτὸν ἡ ψυχὴ μου

Jacob my servant I will uphold; Israel my elect my soul longed for

MT: הן עבדי אֶחָמֶךָ בְּחִירִי רָצָה נַפְשִׁי

Here is my servant, whom I uphold, my chosen, in whom my soul delights;

(4) the mission to the Gentiles and, as we will see below, the rejection and attempt to kill Jesus found in Luke 4,16-30 would square well with the contention that Luke wants to present Jesus as the Servant of YHWH. Furthermore, Luke 7,21-22 take up the thought of 4,18-19, and again specific reference is made to the 'blind seeing'. Probably, Acts 28,28 (cf. 3,6; Isa 40,5) should be mentioned here since it speaks of salvation to the Gentiles which idea we have claimed Luke associates with Jesus as Servant of YHWH.

III. Certain Phrases Point to Jesus as the Servant of YHWH

Luke has predicated certain phrases of Jesus which show that he views him as the Servant of YHWH whom God has specially chosen and with whom he is pleased. We have already seen this in the scene of Jesus' baptism; for the voice from heaven says, 'You are my son, my beloved, with whom I am well pleased'. This last clause accurately represents the sense of the Hebrew of Isa 42,1, רָצָה נַפְשִׁי. Later at the Transfiguration, the voice from the cloud says of Jesus, 'This is my son, my chosen (ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος), listen to him' (Luke 9,35); this is a clear reference to the Hebrew text of Isa 42,1 LXX: Ἰσραὴλ ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου; MT: בְּחִירִי⁽²³⁾. Very probably, in the Transfiguration scene Mark's (9,7) ὁ ἀγαπητός has been changed to ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος (Luke 9,35) so as to identify Jesus with the Servant. Another reference to Isa 42,1 is found during the scene of Jesus' passion when the leaders mock Jesus with the words, 'He saved others, let him save himself, if he is the Christ, the elect (ὁ ἐκλεκτός) of God' (Luke 23,35). Thus, we have three clear references to Isa 42,1 and to Jesus as the Servant of YHWH with whom God is pleased or whom he has chosen for a special task. Of course, the last passage stands in Luke's passion narrative; and so helps to clarify the Servant nature of this task.

⁽²³⁾ Confer F. BOVON, *L'Évangile selon Saint Luc 1-9* (Gèneve 1991) 488-489.

The phrasing of Isa 50,7 in the LXX:

The Lord has been my help; therefore, I have not been disgraced, but I have set my face like flint (ἀλλὰ ἔθηκα τὸ πρόσωπον μου ὡς στερεὰν πέτρην) and I know that I will not be put to shame

leads us to ask the question whether Luke sees Jesus as the Servant of YHWH when he writes of him:

Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ἀναλήμψεως αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐτὸς τὸ πρόσωπον ἐστήρισεν τοῦ πορεύεσθαι εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ

When the days were fulfilled for his being taking up, he set his face to go to Jerusalem (Luke 9,51).

Surely, the phrasing 'I have set my face like flint' resembles 'He set his face'. Moreover, Luke particularly portrays Jesus as the Servant of YHWH during his passion; and the journey to Jerusalem leads precisely to the passion (and resurrection). The reference to the OT and 'fulfilled' would imply that this is God's will; and the Servant did receive his mission from the Lord. Finally, Isa 50,7 LXX itself stands in a context of persecution and opposition (cf. vv. 6.8-9). So, it is quite probable that in Luke 9,51 Luke wants us to view Jesus as the servant who is determined to do what God asks of him.

Another possible reference to the Servant of YHWH tradition may be found in Luke 11,21-22 where Jesus is compared to the stronger warrior who takes away the armor of his opponent and divides the plunder (σκῦλα), for it reminds us of καὶ τῶν ἰσχυρῶν μεριεῖ σκῦλα (Isa 53,12, 'He will divide the spoils of the strong'; cf. Luke 3,16). However, the citation of Isa 53,12 in Luke 11,21-22 is not obvious; for instance, M.D. Hooker feels that the reference is actually to Isa 49,24-25:

μη λήμψεται τις παρὰ γίγαντος σκῦλα καὶ ἐὰν αἰχμαλωτεύσῃ τις ἀδίκως, σωθήσεται; οὕτως λέγει κύριος Ἐάν τις αἰχμαλωτεύσῃ γίγαντα λήμψεται σκῦλα· λαμβάνων δὲ παρὰ ἰσχύοντος σωθήσεται· ἐγὼ δὲ τὴν κρίσιν σου κρινῶ καὶ ἐγὼ τοὺς υἱοὺς σου ῥύσομαι

No one will take the spoils of a giant, will he? If someone unjustly takes a prisoner, will he be rescued? Thus says the Lord, if someone imprisons a giant, he will take the spoils; and the one who takes from the strong will be saved. I will give judgment, and I will rescue your sons (²⁴).

(²⁴) M.D. HOOKER, *Jesus and the Servant*, 73.

IV. Jesus' Resurrection Associated with His Being the Servant of YHWH

Luke has associated Jesus' resurrection with his being the Servant of YHWH:

The God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, the God of our ancestors has glorified his servant Jesus (ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, ἐδόξασεν τὸν παῖδα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν) ... and you killed the author of life whom God raised from the dead (Acts 3,13-15).

The immediate context itself suffices to justify the claim that ἐδόξασεν refers not only to the miracle which Jesus has just performed but also to his resurrection⁽²⁵⁾. True, the miracle could be the only source of this glory. However, between the two statements of Jesus' resurrection in Acts 3,13-15, Peter speaks of his audience's handing over, rejection, and execution of the holy and just one; and so we have a kind of chiasmus which emphasizes Jesus' suffering and resurrection ('glorified' – 'handed over and denied' – 'you denied' – 'you killed whom God raised from the dead'). This claim is supported by the Emmaus story where Jesus chides the two disciples because they do not believe what the prophets said, namely, that the Christ must suffer and enter his glory (καὶ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ; cf. Luke 24,26), for in this passage δόξαν has to be a reference to Jesus' resurrection.

Another passage which probably likewise refers to Jesus' resurrection is the citation of Isa 53,8 in Acts 8,33, ὅτι αἴρεται ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἡ ζωὴ αὐτοῦ⁽²⁶⁾. It appears that Luke has intentionally not included all of the actual LXX text:

ὅτι αἴρεται ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἡ ζωὴ αὐτοῦ, ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνομιῶν τοῦ λαοῦ μου ἤχθη εἰς θάνατον

That his life was taken from the earth; for the transgressions of my people, he was lead to death.

This allows Luke to do two things. As noted above, he apparently wanted not to speak of Jesus' death as redemptive; but also the wording of the other part of Isa 53,8 found in Acts 8,33, 'that his life was taken from earth', could mean that Jesus' life was moved from earth and so

⁽²⁵⁾ G. VOSS, *Die Christologie der lukanischen Schriften*, 133, cites other authors who hold this position. See also M. RESE, *Alttestamentliche Motive*, 112-113. (Pace) E. HAENCHEN, *The Acts of the Apostles. A Commentary* (Philadelphia 1971) 205.

⁽²⁶⁾ See A.F. LOISY, *Les Actes des Apôtres* (Paris 1920) 379-380 and F. SCHÜTZ, *Der Leidende Christus* (BWANT 5/9; Stuttgart 1969) 103-104.

carry the nuance of Jesus' resurrection. This interpretation finds support in Luke's almost universal practice of not mentioning Jesus' death without referring to his resurrection⁽²⁷⁾. Besides, it is not easy to imagine how the Ethiopian eunuch would have been that impressed by a gospel message which related only Jesus' meek, silent and humble death.

V. Jesus as Servant of YHWH is Also Active after His Resurrection

At both the beginning (Acts 3,13) and the end of Peter's discourse in the Portico of Solomon, Jesus is identified as *παῖς*. According to v. 13 God glorified his Servant; at the end of the discourse Peter asserts that God has raised up his servant (*τὸν παῖδα αὐτοῦ*) and sent him to bless the Jews in turning each of them from their evil (v. 26). Elsewhere, I have argued that 'raise' in both vv. 22 and 26 refers to Jesus' resurrection⁽²⁸⁾. Thus, after his resurrection Jesus, the Servant of YHWH, is imaged as a priest sent to bless the Jews; this post-resurrectional blessing consists in the turning each of them from their evil. The other passage in which after his resurrection Jesus, as the Servant of YHWH, would obviously be active is Acts 4,30. Above we argued that in 4,27, Jesus, the holy servant whom God anointed, should not only be understood as Messiah because of the mention of God's servant David in v. 25, but also as Servant of YHWH. If this interpretation be accurate, then in 4,30, the persecuted Christians would be praying that God work signs, wonders and marvels through Jesus who is likewise the Servant of YHWH. However, the miracles spoken about in this verse must now clearly occur after Jesus' resurrection, so the Christians' petition must look to a post-resurrectional activity on the risen Jesus' part.

Two other passages which we have already studied indirectly view Jesus, the Servant, as active after his resurrection, namely, Acts 13,47 and 26,23. Each of these passages attributes to Jesus, with Servant-of-YHWH terminology, an activity which is actually being carried out by his followers. In 13,46-47, Paul and Barnabas tell their Jewish audience

⁽²⁷⁾ Perhaps, the only example which one can find where Luke writes of Jesus' death without reference to his resurrection would be Luke 9,44. In all the other instances, the mention of Jesus' death is accompanied by the message of his resurrection.

⁽²⁸⁾ R.F. O'TOOLE, "Some Observations on *Anistêmi*, 'I Raise', in Acts 3:22,26", *ScEsp* 31 (1979) 85-92.

that it was first necessary to speak the word of God to them; but since they rejected it and did not judge themselves worthy of eternal life, Peter and Barnabas were going to turn to the Gentiles since the Lord had commanded them, 'I have set you (σέ) to be a light for the Gentiles, so that you (σέ) may bring salvation to the ends of the earth'. Since σέ surely does not refer to them, Barnabas and Paul must be carrying out a mission which is attributed to Jesus. Much the same statement has to be made about Acts 26,23 which speaks of the Messiah who must suffer and be first to rise from the dead to proclaim light to the people and to the Gentiles; for during his earthly life, Jesus did not proclaim light to the Gentiles. On the contrary, this task is part of the mission given by the risen Jesus to Paul (cf. vv. 17-18) but which Luke identifies as the continual work of Jesus ⁽²⁹⁾.

* * *

Not all of the above Lukan references to Jesus as the Servant of YHWH may be equally convincing; nor has our investigation been limited only to Isaian hymns, today associated with this theme. Moreover, the word-pattern for this theme is not always as clear as would be desirable. On the other hand, many of the above Servant of YHWH references are unique to Luke (e.g., Luke 2,29-32; 4,18-19; 7,21; 9,51; 11,21-22 [?]; 20,20; 22,19.37.48; 23,9.35; 24,7.20; Acts 3,13-14.26; 4,27.30; 8,32-33; 13,47; 26,23; 28,28 [?]). This is not to deny that a few of these citations might be questionable or that Luke got some of these citations or terminology from his sources, e.g., the use of παραδίδωμι from Mark. So, although some authors have questioned whether the tradition of Servant of YHWH enters into Luke's christology, the evidence shows that it does: some aspects of the tradition about the Servant form a not insignificant aspect of Luke's christology. To be sure, for Luke no one Jewish tradition or title was able to express fully who Jesus was. However, a few passages (cf. Luke 2,29-34; 4,18-19; Acts 13,47; 26,23) provide a general summary of Jesus' ministry in terms of Servant of YHWH terminology. These passages particularly look to Jesus' saving activity, universal mission and suffering. In fact, although the concept 'prophet' provided Luke with a means of explaining Jesus' suffering (e.g., Luke 4,24-30; 13,33-35), that of 'Servant of YHWH' was more suited for this purpose.

⁽²⁹⁾ See R.F. O'TOOLE, *Acts 26: The Christological Climax of Paul's Defense* (Ac 22:1-26:32) (AnBib 78; Rome 1978) 118-122.

Also, Luke's use of 'light' for salvation very likely depends on the Servant of YHWH tradition, and this tradition likewise provided him with his best argument for Jesus' universal mission.

Other Lukan passages use Servant-of-YHWH terminology to bring out given characteristics of Jesus. He, as Servant, is specially chosen and pleasing to God and determined to do God's will as is revealed by his setting his face firmly for Jerusalem; probably he, as Servant, is the stronger warrior who carries off the plunder of his opponents.

For Luke Acts 8,32-33 provide a summary of Jesus' passion. Obviously, as a citation, the passage underlines that these events somehow fit into God's providence. It is true that during the passion Luke also names Jesus the Christ, King and Son of God; but, granted that the Christ must suffer, none of these designations serves to provide a broad summary of Jesus' passion. Nor is it sufficient to assign Luke's passion story to the genre of the martyrdom of a just man. Rather Luke is more specific and presents Jesus as the Servant of YHWH who is humble and silent, but who is still deprived of a fair trial and will not even be remembered. Gentiles, Jews, king and procurator unite against him; he is handed over and led before both Jewish and Roman authorities. However, the fact is that, as the theme of Servant of YHWH confirms, he is innocent. Probably, διδόμενον in Luke 22,19 should be taken in the sense of handed over, but Jesus' willingness to follow his Father's will is clearly present in the context. The correct interpretation of what is said about Jesus as 'the one who serves' in Luke 22,24-27 is not easy to establish. However, given the correspondence of these verses to their immediate context and their similarity to the thought of Acts 8,32-33, it is reasonable to conclude that they identify Jesus' passion as 'service' and constitute part of the Lukan portrayal of Jesus as the Servant of YHWH.

The portrayal of Jesus as Servant of YHWH likewise relates to his resurrection because God glorifies his servant; and probably the words of Acts 8,33, ὅτι αἴρεται ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἡ ζωὴ αὐτοῦ, are a reference to the resurrection. Surely, as the Servant of YHWH, Jesus remains active after his resurrection; for he blesses the Jews in turning each of them from their evil, and the persecuted Christians pray that God work signs and wonders for them through the name of his holy servant. Through his followers he also carries on his mission.

If one asks what specifically Luke achieves through his presentation of Jesus as the Servant of YHWH, the followings points should be noted. This presentation does belong to Luke's christology

and can function as a summary of Jesus' mission. He is God's chosen one. The Servant Tradition particularly served Luke to explain Jesus' suffering and passion and to underline his innocence. Moreover, the theme of Jesus as Servant of YHWH expands Lukan 'salvation' with special reference to the image of 'light' and justifies Jesus' mission to the Gentiles.

Pontificio Istituto Biblico
Via della Pilotta, 25
I-00187 Roma

Robert F. O'TOOLE

SUMMARY

This article explains Luke's meaning of Jesus as Servant of YHWH and claims this title as part of Luke's christology. Many references to Jesus as Servant of YHWH are unique to Luke, and a few summarize Jesus' ministry. These summary passages particularly look to Jesus' saving activity, universal mission and suffering. Other Servant of YHWH passages point out that Jesus is specially chosen and pleasing to God and determined to do his will. In particular, Acts 8,32-33 summarize Jesus' passion during which Luke views Jesus as the Servant and thus humble, innocent and silent. As the Servant Jesus is also risen and active.

The Crux at Hebrews 5,7-8

One of the classic cruxes in the Epistle to the Hebrews is the passage at Heb 5,7-8 which speaks of the petitions made by Christ. The Greek text of these verses, as well as of the following vv. 9-10, is as follows:

ὃς ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ δεήσεις τε καὶ ἱκετηρίας πρὸς τὸν
δυνάμενον σώζειν αὐτὸν ἐκ θανάτου μετὰ κραυγῆς ἰσχυρᾶς καὶ
δακρύων προσενέγκας καὶ εἰσακουσθεὶς ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας, 5.8 καίπερ
ὢν υἱὸς, ἔμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν τὴν ὑπακοήν, 5.9 καὶ τελειωθεὶς ἐγένετο
πᾶσιν τοῖς ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ αἴτιος σωτηρίας αἰωνίου, 5.10
προσαγορευθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀρχιερεὺς κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισέδεκ⁽¹⁾.

A translation would read as follows:

⁷ who in the days of his flesh, offered with a loud cry and tears prayers and petitions to the one able to save him from death, and having been heard because of His reverence, ⁸ even though Son, learned from the things He suffered obedience, ⁹ and once brought to perfection became for all those who obeyed him cause of eternal salvation, ¹⁰ having been addressed by God as high priest according to the order of Melchizedek.

There are a number of problems associated with these verses, but one problem is crucial: Jesus seems to be pictured as begging to be saved from death and as having been heard. But this seems to contradict the obvious fact that Jesus died. The problem centers on the words καὶ εἰσακουσθεὶς ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας, καίπερ ὢν υἱὸς ('and having been heard because of His reverence even though Son')⁽²⁾.

I. Proposed Solutions Which Seem To Be Unsatisfactory

Attempts to solve this crux have taken different forms. The following presentation would seem to account for the major suggestions made in view of a solution:

1. *Jesus Was Delivered from Fear*

Jesus was 'heard out of his fear', i.e., was heard in such a way that he was delivered from fear. This is the way His prayer was

⁽¹⁾ There are no major textual variants.

⁽²⁾ Cf. J. SWETNAM, *Jesus and Isaac*. A Study of the Epistle to the Hebrews in the Light of the Aqedah (AnBib 94; Rome 1981) 178-184.

answered⁽³⁾. There are three difficulties with this interpretation. 1) The meaning 'out of' seems impossible to sustain for ἀπό in the context. 2) The word εὐλάβεια as found in Hebrews does not seem to have the meaning 'fear' in the sense of 'terror' to judge from the use of the word in 12,28 and of the related word εὐλαβηθεῖς in 11,7, and it is difficult to conceive how Jesus could be praised for his trust in God (2,13) and proposed as the 'originator of faith' (12,2) if, when he was tested, he became a prey to terror. 3) The context speaks of God as one 'able to save Him from death', which is not the same as 'fear of death' ⁽⁴⁾.

2. *Jesus Was Simply Heard*

Jesus was 'heard' and then learned obedience because of His reverence, i.e., a partial stop is understood between εἰσακουσθεῖς and ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας so that the phrase 'because of his reverence' goes with ἔμαθεν ... τὴν ὑπακοήν ⁽⁵⁾. This interpretation leaves the two phrases ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας and καίπερ ὧν υἱός dangling awkwardly before the verb ἔμαθεν. This solution is only apparent: it still either leaves unexplained just how Jesus was 'heard' or else implies that the learning itself was the way in which He was heard, in which case ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας is still the reason for His being heard ⁽⁶⁾.

3. *Jesus Was Not Heard*

Jesus was not 'heard', i.e., a corruption in the text is presumed and the negative particle οὐκ is introduced before εἰσακουσθεῖς ⁽⁷⁾. The logic of the existence of οὐκ in the original text would seem to demand that the interpretation of εὐλάβεια in 5,7 was 'terror', for it is too

⁽³⁾ Cf. R. BULTMANN, "εὐλαβής κτλ.", *TWNT* II, 750-751.

⁽⁴⁾ SWETNAM, *Jesus and Isaac*, 178-179.

⁽⁵⁾ This opinion appears in the grammar of Blaß – Debrunner in the 9th and 10th editions which are the basis of the English edition of Funk. But it does not appear in the recent editions of Blaß – Debrunner edited by Rehkopf. (F. BLAß – A. DEBRUNNER – R.W. FUNK, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. A Translation and Revision of the ninth-tenth German edition incorporating supplementary notes of A. Debrunner by R.W. Funk [Cambridge – Chicago 1961] §211 [p. 114]). F. BLAß – A. DEBRUNNER, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*. Edited by F. Rehkopf. 14th ed. (Göttingen 1976).

⁽⁶⁾ SWETNAM, *Jesus and Isaac*, 179.

⁽⁷⁾ A. VON HARNACK, "Zwei alte dogmatische Korrekturen im Hebräerbrief", *SPAW.PH* (Berlin 5/1929) 69-72.

paradoxical to say that Jesus was not heard 'because of His reverence' for God. But the fact that no manuscript has the οὐκ makes any discussion moot⁽⁸⁾.

4. *Jesus Was Heard by Being Glorified*

Jesus was 'heard' in the sense that he was freed from death by being glorified⁽⁹⁾. This interpretation gives a satisfactory meaning to εἰσακουσθεῖς and ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας, but does not explain καίπερ ὦν υἱός, which is severed from what precedes⁽¹⁰⁾. Further, the parenthesis which this interpretation makes out of the phrase καίπερ ὦν υἱός ἔμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν τὴν ὑπακοήν would seem to function as a description of εὐλάβεια, but if so, the εὐλάβεια must be an expression of obedience which the Son learns, but this obedience in turn is said to be the result of things Jesus 'suffered' (ἔπαθεν). But in Hebrews 'to suffer' is a term used for Jesus' death. If Jesus' obedience resulted from His death, and if His reverence resulted from His obedience, it seems impossible that His reverence be the cause for His asking to be freed from death by being glorified. Finally, the most telling objection against this interpretation is that it seems to make Jesus untrusting in the face of death: He has to descend to loud cries and tears in order to beg for glorification, hardly a model to be held up to those Christians who are being 'tested' as Jesus was 'tested' — cf. Heb 2,18⁽¹¹⁾.

5. *Jesus Was Heard after Fear*

Jesus was 'heard' *after* He feared, i.e., Jesus was heard after an experience of fearing⁽¹²⁾. This argument is based on the use of the preposition ἀπό in Heb 11,34 and elsewhere in Hebrews. But this interpretation again implies that εὐλάβεια means 'fear' in the sense of

⁽⁸⁾ SWETNAM, *Jesus and Isaac*, 179-180.

⁽⁹⁾ J. JEREMIAS, "Hbr 5 7-10", ZNW 44 (1952-1953) 107-111 (repr. in J. JEREMIAS, *Abba*. Studien zur neutestamentlichen Theologie und Zeitgeschichte [Göttingen 1966] 319-323).

⁽¹⁰⁾ Cf. F. SCHEIDWEILER, "Καίπερ, nebst einem Exkurs zum Hebräerbrief", *Hermes* 83 (1955) 224-226. Scheidweiler argues that in order to introduce what follows, in this case ἔμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν τὴν ὑπακοήν, some introductory word such as καί would be necessary. In Hebrews καίπερ is not found with any introductory word in the three places it is found: Heb 5,8; 7,5; 12,17. In the last two texts the phrase it introduces refers to what precedes it.

⁽¹¹⁾ SWETNAM, *Jesus and Isaac*, 180-181.

⁽¹²⁾ P. ANDRIESEN – A. LENGLET, "Quelques passages difficiles de l'Épître aux Hébreux (5,7.11; 10,20; 12,2)", *Bib* 51 (1970) 208-212.

'terror'. Further, this interpretation does not explain how Jesus was 'heard'. Proponents of this position claim that the author of Hebrews was not interested in knowing how Jesus was heard and was concerned only to show that Jesus had to go through the human experience of fear, and that the nature of His petition and just how it was answered were secondary concerns. But this view ignores the emphasis on the petition of Jesus in the first part of 5,7⁽¹³⁾.

6. *Jesus Was Heard by Learning Obedience through His Suffering*

Jesus was 'heard' by being enabled to learn obedience through what He suffered⁽¹⁴⁾. This interpretation takes the phrase *καίπερ ὧν υἱός* as referring to what follows, the phrase *ἔμαθεν ἅφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν τὴν ὑπακοήν*; this seems unlikely since it conflicts with the usage elsewhere in Hebrews and in the New Testament, which always has the phrase referring to what precedes⁽¹⁵⁾. Further, this interpretation understands Christ's being heard not as an answer to what He is pleading for but as an answer to what is implied in His plea — His willingness to obey. But it is not clear how this implicit willingness to obey is to be differentiated from the explicit obedience which He learned: In Hebrews Christ is portrayed as coming into the world to do God's will (Heb 10,5-7), i.e., He already is obedient explicitly⁽¹⁶⁾.

⁽¹³⁾ SWETNAM, *Jesus and Isaac*, 181-182.

⁽¹⁴⁾ P. ELLINGWORTH, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. A Commentary on the Greek Text (NIGTC; Grand Rapids – Carlisle 1993) 286-291. 'The connection between vv. 7 and 8 may thus be paraphrased as follows: "Jesus, in the face of the cross, offered strong and anguished prayers to God as the one who had power to rescue him from the power of death itself. God heard and answered these prayers because in them Jesus submitted himself humbly to God's will. From the agony in which he prayed, and from his final acceptance of God's will, he learned obedience — something necessary even for one who was God's Son"' (ibid., 291). What is clearly operative here is the supposition that what is being referred to is the 'Agony in the Garden'.

⁽¹⁵⁾ Ibid., 289. Ellingworth notes, however that there are examples in the Septuagint which have *καίπερ ὧν υἱός* referring to what follows. Scheidweiler (cf. above n. 10) argues that when *καίπερ ὧν υἱός* is used as an introduction it has some added element.

⁽¹⁶⁾ The above list of suggested solutions which do not seem to be satisfactory makes no pretense of being exhaustive. For further bibliographical leads cf.: ELLINGWORTH, *Hebrews*, 291; SWETNAM, *Jesus and Isaac*, 178-184; C. SPICQ, *L'Épître aux Hébreux* (ÉB; Paris 1953) II, 112-118; W.L. LANE, *Hebrews 1-8* (WBC 47; Dallas 1991) 105-124.

II. Another Suggested Solution

The text at Heb 5,7-8 offers a complicated challenge. A number of elements have to be reconciled with each other in such a way that the resulting meaning makes sense in the particular and general context of the epistle. A preliminary survey of the various components of the text (vv. 7-8) and context (vv. 9-10) would seem to be called for:

ὅς ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ — these words refer to the existence of Christ (cf. 5,5) before His death and resurrection.

δεήσεις τε καὶ ἱκετηρίας — these two words, are probably synonymous⁽¹⁷⁾ and are used together for purposes of stylistic reinforcement and rhetorical effect.

πρὸς τὸν δυνάμενον σῶζειν αὐτὸν ἐκ θανάτου — the expression refers to God and can either refer to prevention of death or rescue from death through resurrection⁽¹⁸⁾.

μετὰ κραυγῆς ἰσχυρᾶς καὶ δακρύων — the mention of tears indicates that the κραυγή is one of suffering⁽¹⁹⁾.

προσενέγκας — the word προσφέρω is used in Hebrews always in a cultic or sacrificial sense except at 12,7 where it has the more general idea of 'treat'⁽²⁰⁾. Its use in the immediate context (cf. 5,1.3, with reference to the Aaronic high priest), indicates that in 5,7 it is being used in a cultic, sacrificial sense but metaphorically, with a distinctively Christian meaning, since it concerns Christ's earthly, cultic sacrifice⁽²¹⁾.

(17) ELLINGWORTH, *Hebrews*, 287.

(18) Ibid., 288. 'If the reference is specifically to Gethsemane, the first alternative is more likely; if the reference is more generally to the passion as a whole, the second meaning is probable...' (Ibid., 288). The supposition of a possible link with Gethsemane is to be noted.

(19) Ibid., 288-289. 'For the thought of intense prayer as an inarticulate cry, cf. Rom. 8:15f., 26, a passage which, like the present verse, may reflect traditions related to the Gethsemane story (Mk. 14:36). However, in the argument of Hebrews there is probably a wider inference to the passion as a whole' (Ibid., 289).

(20) Ibid., 289.

(21) 'In his human condition, in confrontation with death, Christ 'offered' prayers. The participle προσενέγκας is from the same verb (προσφέρω) used in a technical sense for offering sacrifice in vv 1 and 3. It has often been suggested that this is a particular point of comparison between Christ and the ordinary high priests, both of whom must make a sacrifice for themselves before sacrificing for the people. This understanding presses the comparison between Christ and the high priests too far, since, as already noted, Christ's sinlessness precludes the necessity of his having to offer sacrifice for himself. The participle, then, is used here in its common metaphorical way' (H.W. ATTRIDGE, *The Epistle to the*

καὶ εἰσακουσθεῖς — the word is used for answering a petition in prayer⁽²²⁾. The passive is theological, i.e., God is the implied agent.

ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας — here the exegesis becomes more problematic. But given the usage of εὐλάβεια elsewhere in Hebrews and in the New Testament, the meaning 'reverence' seems more probable than the alternative 'fear' ⁽²³⁾. And this, in turn, suggests that the preposition ἀπὸ is to be understood in a causal, rather than in a temporal sense ⁽²⁴⁾. The meaning is that Christ was heard because of His 'reverence' — in 12,28 εὐλάβεια is paired with δέος, 'awe', in a hendiadys meaning 'reverent awe' in a context which speaks of worship ⁽²⁵⁾. The motive for Christ's urgent pleas have to do with His reverent awe and in association with cult.

καίπερ ὧν υἱός — this is the much-discussed phrase whose position is generally taken to refer to what follows, i.e., it introduces the thought expressed by ἔμαθεν ἄφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν τὴν ὑπακοήν ⁽²⁶⁾ instead of serving as a decisive pendent to what precedes, which means above all εἰσακουσθεῖς ⁽²⁷⁾.

ἔμαθεν ἄφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν τὴν ὑπακοήν — in the context of the epistle it is clear that Jesus was already obedient when He offered up His loud petitions (cf. 10,5-10). Therefore the only way He can 'learn' obedience is that He comes to the realization of what obedience to God's will entails ⁽²⁸⁾.

Hebrews [Hermeneia; Philadelphia 1989] 149). It would seem rather that the participle of προσφέρω is used at Heb 5,7 in a metaphorical way because it has as its object only δεήσεις and ἱκετηρίαί, not because it is being offered for one who is not offering for His own sins. Christ's was a true sacrifice and this is conveyed by the use of προσφέρω elsewhere in *Hebrews* (e.g., 7,27; 8,3; 9,28; 10,12), indicating that προσφέρω. In these cases the object of the sacrifice is Himself.

⁽²²⁾ Cf. Lk 1,13, where it is used with δέησις, as here.

⁽²³⁾ ELLINGWORTH, *Hebrews*, 289-290.

⁽²⁴⁾ Ibid., 290-291.

⁽²⁵⁾ ATTRIDGE, *Hebrews*, 82-383.

⁽²⁶⁾ For example, ELLINGWORTH, *Hebrews*, 292; ATTRIDGE, *Hebrews*, 152; E. GRÄBER, *An die Hebräer* (EKKNT 17/1; Zürich – Neukirchen-Vluyn 1990) 303-304. Gräber identifies his position as part of the 'Mehrheitsexegese' (303, n. 291).

⁽²⁷⁾ Cf. above, n. 10, and the syntactical arguments of Scheidweiler in favor of construing καίπερ ὧν υἱός with what precedes. ELLINGWORTH, *Hebrews*, 289, admits that in the New Testament καίπερ ὧν υἱός always introduces a clause related to a preceding main verb (Phil 3,4; Heb 7,5; Heb 12,17; 2 Pet 1,12), but says that it is not true of the Septuagint. 'It is not therefore necessary to adopt the harsh construction "he was heard ... although he was a son"' (ibid., 289).

⁽²⁸⁾ 'A fundamental affirmation of *Hebrews* is that Jesus was obedient to God's will from the start of his earthly career (10:5-10). Thus, he can learn

καὶ τελειωθείς — this ‘perfection’ refers to the second, definitive stage of Christ’s priesthood which follows on His resurrection⁽²⁹⁾.

ἐγένετο πᾶσιν τοῖς ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ αἴτιος σωτηρίας αἰωνίου — Christ is the cause of salvation for those who believe in Him in His resurrected state. The obedience of His followers mirrors His own obedience. Both are rooted in the benevolent will of the Father. The word σωτηρία is related to the verb σώζω in v. 7⁽³⁰⁾.

προσαγορευθείς ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ — here the divine passive becomes explicit. The word προσαγορευθείς parallels the word καλούμενος in v. 4⁽³¹⁾.

ἄρχιερεὺς κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισέδεκ — Christ is designated ‘high priest according to the order of Melchisedek’ at His resurrection. This has been stated in vv. 5-6 by combining Ps 2,7 (a reference to the resurrection — cf. Heb 1,5) and Ps 110,4 in a *gezerah shawah* construction⁽³²⁾, the common word being σύ.

1. An Interpretation Based on Syntax

The main crux is the seeming impossibility of Christ being heard ‘although He was son’, i.e., taking the phrase καίπερ ὢν υἱός as referring to what precedes rather than to what follows. Even if it is granted on the basis of usage outside the New Testament that the phrase could refer to what follows, the fact that the other four uses in the New Testament refer to what precedes would seem to indicate that this is the more probable interpretation for Heb 5,7: God, who can save from death, heard Christ’s petitions even though Christ was Son. Unfortunately, it is not clear how this interpretation could have any reasonable meaning at all; hence the efforts to seek some other syntactical explanation. Further, Christ was heard because of His piety but learned obedience from the things He suffered — ἐμαθεν ἀφ’ ὧν ἔπαθεν τὴν ὑπακοήν. Again, it is not clear just how this is to be construed with the phrase καίπερ ὢν υἱός and with the rest of the

obedience only in the sense that he comes to appreciate fully what conformity to God’s will means’ (ATTRIDGE, *Hebrews*, 153).

⁽²⁹⁾ Cf. J. SWETNAM, “Christology and the Eucharist in the Epistle to the Hebrews”, *Bib* 70 (1989) 76-78.

⁽³⁰⁾ ELLINGWORTH, *Hebrews*, 295.

⁽³¹⁾ *Ibid.*, 295.

⁽³²⁾ ‘... an exegetical argument in which a term in one verse of scripture is interpreted according to its use in another’ (ATTRIDGE, *Hebrews*, 128-129).

passage. But, on the strength of the greater syntactic probability, the following translation would seem to be indicated:

⁷ ... who, in the days of His flesh, having offered up prayers and supplications with a loud and tearful cry to the one who was able to save Him from death, and having been heard because of His reverence ⁸ although He was Son, learned obedience from what He suffered, ⁹ and having been brought to perfection He became for all who obeyed Him cause of an eternal salvation, ¹⁰ having been designated by God high priest according to the order of Melchizedek.

The challenge is to see what the above translation means. Two principal points need to be explained: (a) In what sense can Christ be 'heard' 'even though He is son'. (b) In what sense can Christ 'learn obedience from the things He suffered'.

2. A Plausible Sitz im Leben for the Interpretation Based on Syntax

a) In What Sense Christ Can Be 'Heard' Even Though Son

Many commentators instinctively look to the Agony in Gethsemane as the scene to which Heb 5,7-10 refer⁽³³⁾. But an analysis of the key words of the verses yields a different source. Much more plausible as a point of reference is Ps 22 [21],25⁽³⁴⁾:

ὅτι οὐκ ἐξουδένωσεν οὐδὲ προσώχθισεν τῇ δεήσει τοῦ πτωχοῦ οὐδὲ ἀπέστρεψεν τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἀπ' ἐμοῦ καὶ ἐν τῷ κεκραγέναι με πρὸς αὐτὸν εἰσήκουσέν μου⁽³⁵⁾

For he has not despised nor disregarded the petition of the poor one, nor turned away his face from me, and in my cry to him he has heard me⁽³⁶⁾.

The reason for citing Ps 22 [21],25 as the principal source of the terminology of Heb 5,7-8 is the convergence of three words used in both passages: δέησις, κράζω and εἰσακούω. Further, in v. 3 are found κράζω and εἰσακούω, and in v. 6 κράζω and σώζω, and these verses accordingly

⁽³³⁾ Cf., for example, SPICQ, *Hébreux*, 113: '... Hébr. se réfère certainement à l'agonie de Gethsémani dont il commente le récit évangélique ou dont il est informé par une autre source'.

⁽³⁴⁾ 'NA²⁶ war ... gut beraten am Rande nur Ps 22,25 (»er hat sein Schreien gehört«) anzugeben...' (GRÄBER, *An die Hebräer*, 313). Spicq holds that Hebrews is thinking of the Agony in Gethsemane, but says that the language is influenced by Ps 22,2.6.25 (*Hébreux*, 113).

⁽³⁵⁾ A. RAHLFS (ed.), *Psalmi cum Odis* (Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum; Göttingen 1967) 111.

⁽³⁶⁾ Translation by the present author.

support Ps 22 [21] as the source of the allusions in Heb 5,7-8. Attribution of some of the distinctive key vocabulary of Heb 5,7-8 to Ps 22 [21],²⁵ would seem to suggest that the author is portraying the offering of Jesus in terms of this psalm. The use of Ps 22 [21] to elucidate the death of Jesus at Heb 5,7-8 would hardly be a novelty for a New Testament author, for Ps 22 [21] was *the* psalm and *the* Old Testament text in general for interpreting the death of Jesus on the cross⁽³⁷⁾.

Jesus is presented as uttering the introductory verse of Ps 22 [21] in both Mark and Matthew as He is about to die (Mk 15,34; Mt 27,46). And the reaction of some of the bystanders is given: they were saying that a pause should be allowed to see if Elijah comes to 'take Jesus down' from the cross (καθαίρεω — Mark) or to 'save' Him (σώζω — Matthew). Whether this interpretation of the cry of Jesus was malicious or not is irrelevant for the present purpose: both evangelists presuppose that there was a general belief that Jesus could possibly be saved by Elijah, i.e., by divine intervention acting through Elijah as the precursor of the Kingdom (Mark 1,6; 9,11-13)⁽³⁸⁾ or as acting as a more obvious divine agent (Mt 27,49)⁽³⁹⁾.

Viewed against this background, Jesus' utterance of the opening verse of Ps 22 [21], with its implication that the opening verse stands for the psalm in its entirety⁽⁴⁰⁾, can be viewed as a plea that this divine intervention through Elijah not be carried out.

This interpretation would square with another aspect of the death of Jesus in Matthew and Mark, the two gospels which cite the opening verse of Ps 22 [21] as a cry of Jesus. For in both of these gospels, when Jesus finally dies, there is voiced the recognition that He was a 'son of God' (Mk 15,39; Mt 27,54). This would help explain the use of the idea of 'son' in Heb 5,8. But the word 'son' in Hebrews is not modified by

⁽³⁷⁾ Cf.: Mt 27,46; Mc 15,34 (v. 2); Lk 18,7 (v. 3); Rom 5,5 (v.6); Mc 9,12 (v. 7); Mt 27,29.39; Mc 15,29 (v. 8); Lk 23,35 (vv. 8-9); Mat 27,43 (v. 9); 1 Pet 5,8 (v. 14); Mt 27,35; Mc 15,24; Lk 23,34; Jn 19,24 (v. 19); 2 Thes 4,17 (v. 22); Jn 20,17; Heb 2,12 (v. 23); Apoc 19,5 (v. 24); Heb 5,7 (v. 25); Apoc 11,15 (v. 29) (NA²⁷ [1994 2. Druck] 784).

⁽³⁸⁾ Cf. D.J. HARRINGTON, "The Gospel according to Mark", *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary* (Englewood Cliffs 1990) 628 (§106).

⁽³⁹⁾ Cf. B.T. VIVIANO, "The Gospel according to Matthew", *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*, 672 (§163): 'save. Matthew changes Mark's "take down" to the theologically more appropriate "save"'.
⁽⁴⁰⁾ H. GESE, "Psalm 22 und das Neue Testament. Der älteste Bericht vom Tode Jesu und die Entstehung des Herrenmahles", *ZTK* 65 (1968) 1. Cf. also M. DALY-DENTON, *David in the Fourth Gospel*. The Johannine Reception of the Psalms (AGJU 47; Leiden – Boston – Köln 2000) 22-23, 24.

reference to God, implying that 'son' is being used in a more general sense. What seems to be taking place in Heb 5,8 is that the author of Hebrews is taking the idea of the death of Jesus as 'son of God', an idea which he finds in Matthew and Mark, and enlarges it to take in Jesus as 'son of Abraham' or even 'son of man' ⁽⁴¹⁾. As alluded to in Hebrews, the phrase *καίπερ ὢν υἱός* alludes not only to the divine sonship of Jesus, which would militate against His being allowed to offer Himself in sacrifice, but also to Isaac, who enjoyed a last-minute reprieve from death (cf. Heb 11,19 and the phrase *ἐν παραβολῇ*): this plea of Jesus in Heb 5,8 is a request that He not be spared as Isaac was spared by a last-minute divine intervention through the agency of the angel (Gen 22,11-14). On grounds then of His 'reverence' His plea was 'heard', i.e., granted, so that He was allowed to die. And this even though He was the son foreshadowed by Isaac and could thus be presumed to deserve freedom from death just as Isaac was freed from death. Thus the phrase *καίπερ ὢν υἱός* can be viewed as an adaptation of the plea of Ps 22 [21] expressed in language appropriate to Hebrews. Here, then, is a plausible *Sitz im Leben* for the phrase *καίπερ ὢν υἱός*, and one which seems to be indicated by the language of Heb 5,7-8.

b) In What Sense Christ Can 'Learn Obedience from the Things He Suffered'

There remains the second question, i.e., of giving a plausible *Sitz im Leben* to the clause *ἔμαθεν ὁφ; ὢν ἔπαθεν τὴν ὑπακοήν*. The clause can be inferred to indicate that Jesus comes to appreciate fully the *implications* of being obedient to the divine will, since He is portrayed in Hebrews as obedient to that will from His entrance into the world (cf. 10,5-10) ⁽⁴²⁾. To perceive what these implications are it is necessary to

⁽⁴¹⁾ Cf. J. SWETNAM, "The Structure of Hebrews 1,1-3,6", *MTh* 43 (1992) 58-66.

⁽⁴²⁾ 'The alliterative remark that Christ "learned from what he suffered" (*ἔμαθεν ὁφ; ὢν ἔπαθεν*) involves a common Greek proverbial play. This expression was frequently used in a negative way to refer to those who can only learn from their mistakes, although, as in certain instances in Philo, the sense of *παθεῖν* becomes more general and one learns from experience rather than from suffering. Hebrews hardly uses the proverbial expression to point to a failing on Christ's part that needed to be overcome; neither is the sense of *παθεῖν* reduced to "experience". Christ's learning, as is clear from this pericope and from the epistle as a whole, involves real suffering.

The use of the classical proverb may have been inspired by the Jewish sapiential and martyrological notion that suffering is educative, but the effect of the motif here is primarily paraenetic. Although Hebrews does not use hortatory language at this point, a concern for the audience is transparent. Jesus is presented

understand better Ps 22 [21],25, the verse to which Heb 5,7-8 primarily refers, and this means understanding it in its context of the structure of the psalm as a whole.

Ps 22 [21] can be structured as follows: lament as invocation (generalizing references to space and time) (vv. 2-3) – manifestation of trust (references to Israel as a collective reality) (vv. 4-6) – portrait of the individual who is lamenting (use first person personal pronoun to draw attention to his plight) (vv. 7-9) – manifestation of individual trust in God (matching the manifestation of individual distress) (vv. 10-12) – third series of laments (generalizing motifs of persecution culminate in what seems to be an execution scene in v. 20) (vv. 13-19) – formula of petition in v. 20, followed by summarizing repetition of persecutors (in reverse order to vv. 13-19) (vv. 20-22) – an individual hymn of thanksgiving (which has as its *Sitz im Leben* the *tôdâ*) (vv. 23-27) – address to Israel present, Israel past, Israel future (vv. 28-32) (with allusion to the single act of saving — resurrection — in v. 32)⁽⁴³⁾.

In this structure the allusions in Heb 5,7-8 to Ps 22 [21],25 are found in the section of the individual hymn of thanksgiving. The author of Hebrews has a particular interest in this section, for at 2,12 of his epistle he cites Ps 22 [21], 23 (ἀπαγγελῶ τὸ ὄνομά σου τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου, ἐν μέσῳ ἐκκλησίας ὑμνήσω σε). The citation at 2,12 strengthens the case for an allusion to Ps 22 [21],25 at 5,7-8, since both the cited verse at 2,12 and the verse alluded to at 5,7 are found in the same section of Ps 22 [21] (vv. 23-27). Especially striking is the *Sitz im Leben* of this section: the *tôdâ* or hymn of thanksgiving. This apparent interest in the *tôdâ* ceremony (much depends on the interpretation of Ps 22 [21], obviously) is in turn confirmed by another unusual feature of Hebrews: it is the only New Testament writing which has the full Septuagint Greek expression of the *tôdâ* ceremony: θυσία αἰνέσεως (13,15)⁽⁴⁴⁾.

as one who “learns obedience” (ὕποκοήν) in the midst of suffering because that is what the addressees are called upon to do. Hence, speculation on the sense in which Jesus can be said to learn obedience can be misdirected. A fundamental affirmation of Hebrews is that Jesus was obedient to God’s will from the start of his earthly career (10:5-10). Thus, he can learn obedience only in the sense that he comes to appreciate fully what conformity to God’s will means’ (ATTRIDGE, *Hebrews*, 152-153 [references omitted]).

⁽⁴³⁾ GESE, “Psalm 22”, 6-13.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ The expression θυσία αἰνέσεως (the equivalent of זבח תודה) is found in the Septuagint in the following texts: Lev 7,23.15; Ps 49,14; Ps 49,23; Ps 106,23; Ps 115,8.

The *tôdâ* ceremony was a type of thanksgiving offering associated with a bloody sacrifice. Both bloody sacrifice and *tôdâ* ceremony are offered by someone who has escaped from the danger of death, serious illness, or life-threatening persecution. An essential element is a hymn of thanksgiving which serves to recall the salvation achieved. The *tôdâ* ceremony involves such a hymn of thanksgiving plus the offering of leavened bread, and it can involve a cup of wine which serves as the ceremonial proclamation parallel to the bread which is the ceremonial meal. The Psalter indicates that the *tôdâ* had an importance difficult to exaggerate in the religious life of Israel. In Israel, the official post-exilic cult, with its sharp distinction between priests and laity on the basis of a profound concept of holiness, became increasingly a matter for the priesthood, whereas private devotion was largely determined by the *tôdâ* ⁽⁴⁵⁾.

Although the *tôdâ* piety was at home in the private sphere, its horizon was not confined to the individual. For the *tôdâ*-community always represented the whole of the true Israel (for example, cf. Ps 22[21],24). With the advent of apocalyptic theology *tôdâ*-piety was able to open itself to an eschatological perspective. In Ps 22[21] the petitioner's experience of sufferings which are mortal can be seen to be raised up to the level of the experience of sufferings which are primordial. By analogy, salvation sweeps away all historical limits to salvific events and becomes a sign of the eschatological arrival of the Kingdom. *Tôdâ*-piety's basic experience of death and redemption took on, in the perspective of apocalyptic, the dimensions of an absolute, and salvation from death led to the conversion of the world, to the participation of the dead in life, and to the eternal proclamation of salvation (Ps 22[21],8-32) ⁽⁴⁶⁾. (Note the occurrence of 'kingdom' — βασιλεία — in v. 29.)

The cry of Jesus at Mt 27,46 and Mk 15,34 in which He cites the opening verse of Ps 22[21] is designed to indicate not that God had abandoned the petitioner, but that salvation through death — Jesus' death — is the occasion for the arrival of the Kingdom of God as interpreted in Ps 22[21]. Abandonment by God is a common theme in

⁽⁴⁵⁾ H. GESE, "Die Herkunft des Herrenmahls", ID., *Zur biblischen Theologie*. Alttestamentliche Vorträge (Tübingen 1989) 117-121. (Italian transl.: H. GESE, "L'origine della cena del Signore", ID, *Sulla teologia biblica* [BCR 54; Brescia 1989] 141-146).

⁽⁴⁶⁾ GESE, "Die Herkunft des Herrenmahls", 121-122 [GESE, "L'origine della cena del Signore", 146-147].

the psalms, and it is difficult to see what the distinctive purpose of the citation of the opening verse could be if not an indication of this abandonment in the context of the entire psalm, i.e., an abandonment which leads to the advent of the Kingdom⁽⁴⁷⁾.

In the context of the death of Jesus on the cross as portrayed as being understood by Him with reference to Ps 22[21], the *tôdâ* is of crucial importance, because the citation indicates that He thinks of His death as referring to the *tôdâ* which He celebrated with His disciples at the Last Supper⁽⁴⁸⁾. In the *tôdâ* meal the bread offering had a special place (Lev 7,12-15). The use of wine had a prominent part (in Ps 116 vv. 17-18 [LXX 115,8-9] with mention of the *tôdâ* יִבַּח תִּדְּרָה – θυσία αἰνέσεως) are parallel to vv. 13-14 [LXX 115,4-6] with mention of the 'cup of salvation' (כּוֹס-שׁוּעָה – ποτήριον σωτηρίου). The *tôdâ*-meal introduced a new level of fellowship because it introduced a new level of existence characterized by praise of the Lord and the recognition of Him as the one saving (whence the mention of the lament which leads to salvation). This is the *tôdâ* which figures in the second part of Ps 22 [21], in vv. 23-32⁽⁴⁹⁾. The fact that the death of Jesus leads to the arrival of the Kingdom (i.e., in terms of Ps 22[21], the fact that the laments and petitions of vv. 2-22 lead to the joy of vv. 23-32), explains the phrase ἔμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν τὴν ὑπακοήν: Jesus learns by experience the benignant effect of obedience to God's will⁽⁵⁰⁾. The crucial difference between the *tôdâ* celebrated by Jesus and alluded to by Him on the cross (according to the interpretation being advanced here) and the *tôdâ* as it was practiced in the Old Testament world, is that

⁽⁴⁷⁾ Cf. above, n. 40.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ According to Gese the *tôdâ* was associated with the temple worship until the very end, as is clear from the many references to it in the Mishna (GESE, "Psalm 22", 17-18, n. 30).

⁽⁴⁹⁾ GESE, "Psalm 22", 17-18.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ Cf. above, n. 28. This interpretation of Jesus' learning the beneficent effects of obedience becomes stronger if the word εὐλάβεια in the phrase ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας in 5,7 is construed as meaning 'reverential fear motivated by respect for God's will'. In Heb 11,28 the word is used with δέος to indicate the attitude of the addressees to the worship established by Christ's death which, as Heb 5,7 shows, is based on God's will. And at Heb 11,7 Noah is pictured as fashioning the salvation of his household 'in reverence' (εὐλαβηθεὶς). But the original context in Genesis 6,13-22 makes it clear that this fashioning was done in obedience to God (cf. 6,22). Thus in Heb 5,7 Christ is heard because of His reverence for God's will (ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας), an interpretation which fits in well with Heb 10,5-10 and especially with the interpretation of the clause ἔμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν τὴν ὑπακοήν being advanced here.

the *tôdâ* of Jesus is celebrated in faith and trust, since it looks to future deliverance and not to deliverance which is past⁽⁵¹⁾.

Specifically, it is being argued here that in alluding to Ps 22[21] in 5,7-8 the author of Hebrews (1) is indicating the initial cry of Jesus portrayed by Matthew and Mark just before He dies when He cites the introductory verse of the same psalm, and (2) is indicating the point of view from which he wants the allusion to be principally considered: the *tôdâ*. The verses thus are a studied indication that the death of Jesus on the cross is a counterpart to the *tôdâ*-ceremony which He celebrated with His disciples at the Last Supper. The cry of Jesus by which He introduces the psalm ('O God, my God, why have You abandoned me?') is a cry of suffering but which presumes a cry of final triumph: both Jesus' celebration of the *tôdâ* at the Supper and His living out His death which is its bloody counterpart, are carried out before the event, i.e., in faith and trust. The fact that Jesus cries out with the beginning of the psalm indicates that He accepts in this faith and trust the entirety of what the psalm stands for — death and the arrival of the Kingdom to which it leads in the context of the *tôdâ*-celebration of the Last Supper. All of this Jesus accepts and indeed pleads for, as part of God's will. And the Father grants His Son's request, even though it involves death.

*
* * *

The present essay is an attempt to sketch the lines of a solution to the crux at Heb 5,7-8. Through a rigorous syntactical acceptance of what the Greek is probably saying, Jesus seems to be asking to die 'even though He is son' and to be 'heard', i.e., have His petition granted by God (εἰσακουσθεῖς ... καίπερ ὦν υἱός).

A search for a plausible *Sitz im Leben* for this implausible idea indicates that the vocabulary of Heb 5,7 is probably based on Ps 22[21], 21. Ps 22[21] is the primary Old Testament source used for interpreting the passion and death of Jesus, so the finding of relevance for this verse of the psalm is not antecedently improbable. Further, Ps 22[21] is presented in Matthew and Mark as being cited by Jesus as an introduction to the psalm in order to explain how He understands what is happening. And the citation of the verse gives both evangelists the occasion to remark that Elijah is being called on by Jesus to save Him from death. But to attribute to Jesus this plea to be saved from death in

⁽⁵¹⁾ Cf. the expression of trust at Heb 2,13a which follows hard on the citation of Ps 22[21] which is from the section concerning the *tôdâ*.

the context of the beneficent result of Ps 22 [21] is unthinkable: Jesus has come precisely to do God's will. This is the situation which gives a plausible *Sitz im Leben* for Jesus' request to die: He does not wish to be liberated by God through the agency of Elijah or of anyone else.

The explanation of the phrase ἔμαθεν ὅφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν τὴν ὑπακοήν is suggested to be the knowledge growing from experience by Jesus of the result of His antecedent commitment to God's will as expressed in Heb 10,5-10 and possibly alluded to in the phrase ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας of 5,7. It is an experience of the beneficent quality of God's will as manifested in Ps 22 [21] in the arrival of the Kingdom. Thus the intrinsic process of the movement from lamentation to thanksgiving in the psalm becomes the basis for Jesus' growth in experiential obedience.

The above argumentation is intended to serve only as a suggestion for further work. In this same spirit a final suggestion is offered that Jesus as the source of salvation for those who 'believe' in Him (cf. Heb 5,9) alludes to the obedience of the followers of Jesus in performing the Christian *tôdâ* as He commanded them to do: 'Do this in memory of me' (1 Cor 11,24-25). As Jesus was 'obedient' to God's will in submitting to the process of death leading to the Christian *tôdâ* involving the arrival of the Kingdom, so the Christians who are 'obedient' to Christ's will find in Him the cause of their salvation.

Pontificio Istituto Biblico
Via della Pilotta, 25
I-00187 Roma

James SWETNAM

SUMMARY

Heb 5,7-8 is a classic crux. It is not clear, as the text seems to say, how Jesus could beg to be freed from death and then be heard 'although He was son'. Further, it is not clear how Jesus could 'learn obedience from the things He suffered' since Hebrews pictures Him as antecedently ready to do God's will. The present paper reviews some of the principal suggestions which have been made and makes its own: that the *Sitz im Leben* of Jesus' plea is the cross, and the words refer to Ps 22 which Jesus cites in Matthew and Mark. In the context, reference to the psalm is taken by bystanders as an allusion to God intervening through Elijah to save Jesus. Hebrews understands Jesus' citing the initial verse of the psalm as an agreement to all that the psalm implies, i.e., as an implicit petition to die. Further, the main verse alluded to in Ps 22 seems to refer to the *tôdâ* which Jesus celebrated with His disciples, and this explains how He could 'learn' obedience: He learned by experience the benignant effect of obedience to God.

Final Judgments and Ultimate Blessings: The Climactic Visions of Revelation 20,11–21,8

Rev 20,11–21,8 can hardly be called a self-contained pericope, nor even a text unit. Within the major section 16,17–22,5 (seventh bowl and completion) the passage 20,11–15 concludes the text unit of the final judgment which deals with the destruction of the beast, the false prophet and the dragon, and with the judgment of the dead (19,11–20,15), while the new Jerusalem passage 21,1–8 is clearly connected with the description and explanation given by the interpreting angel in 21,9–22,5. These two passages, however, can be taken together. They constitute the final two visions of John the prophet in which something happens to ‘mortals’, one rather negative (the judgment of the dead) and the other very positive (the appearance of the new Jerusalem, the bride) ⁽¹⁾.

Moreover, the two passages — each with a twofold καὶ εἶδον (20,11.12 and 21,1.2) — are also linked by themes and vocabulary: see ‘death’ in 20,14 and 21,4; the identification of ‘the second death’ in 20,14 and 21,8. ‘The lake of fire’ in 20,14 and 15 corresponds to ‘the lake that burns with fire and sulphur’ in 21,8. The disappearance of the (first) heaven and the (first) earth is spoken of in 20,11 as well as in 21,1. ‘Sea’ in 21,1 refers to ‘sea’ in 20,13 (sea, Death and Hades giving up the dead) but also proves that the author has not forgotten its absence in 20,14 (only personified Death and Hades are punished). Moreover, the theme of ‘life’ in the ‘book of life’ (20,12 and 15) reappears in the ‘fountain of the water of life’ in 21,6. Some of those whose ‘name was not found written in the book of life’ in 20,15 are specified in the list

⁽¹⁾ Cf. D.E. AUNE, *Revelation 17–22* (WBC 52; Nashville 1998) ix and 1040–1113, who considers the whole of 19,11–21,8 as belonging together and divides this section into 19,11–21; 20,1–10; 20,11–15 (Vision of the Judgment of the Dead) and 21,1–8 (The Transition to the New Order). C.H. GIBLIN, “The Millennium (Rev 20.4–6) is Heaven”, *NTS* 45 (1999) 553–570, takes 20,11–15 and 21,1–8 together as one narrative (see pp. 568 and 570). In n. 41 he argues: ‘Dividing integral narratives merely by the occurrence of ‘I saw’ is short-sighted here as elsewhere in Revelation’. Applied to 20,11–21,8 this remark might be too sweeping. Cf., in an earlier study, C.H. GIBLIN, *The Book of Revelation* (Good News Studies 34; Collegeville 1991) 177 and 190–196.

of 21,8 ('the cowardly...'); their place is the lake of fire and this is the second death⁽²⁾.

The text of Rev 20,11–21,8 is not without its difficulties and uncertainties. Does 20,11–15 depict a general judgment of all the dead, good and bad, or only the final judgment of the sinners? Is the lot of those condemned annihilation or eternal torment? Does the mention of a first resurrection in 20,5 announce a second resurrection to be found in 20,13? Are the 'new heaven' and the 'new earth' in the second passage (21,1) a completely new creation or should one rather assume a renewal, a transformation of the first heaven and the first earth as 21,5 ('See, I am making all things new') seems to suggest? Furthermore, to what extent is the author dependent on Old Testament Scriptures and/or Jewish as well as extrabiblical traditions? Last but not least, can one detect a really climactic conclusion in these final visions and what is the trustworthy content, negative and positive, hidden in their wealth of images and allusions?

A close reading of 20,11–15 (I) and 21,1–8 (II) will gather elements for answering those questions. For each pericope three aspects will be focused upon: the line of thought (the narrative), the influence of the main Old Testament passages, and the function of the text within its context. In the concluding part of this study (III) special attention will be given to the last double question, i.e., the climactic character of 20,11–21,8, more in particular 21,1–8, and the contemporary hermeneutical approach.

I. The Final Judgment and the Second Death (20,11–15)

This is the translation of Rev 20,11–15 given in the NRSV:

^{11a} Then I saw a great white throne and the one who sat on it; ^b the earth and the heaven fled from his presence, ^c and no place was found for them. ^{12a} And I saw the dead, great and small, standing before the throne, ^b and books were opened. ^c Also another book was opened, the book of life. ^d And the dead were judged according to their works, as recorded in the books. ^{13a} And the sea gave up the dead that were in it, ^b Death and Hades gave up the dead that were in them, ^c and all were judged according to what they had done. ^{14a} Then Death and Hades

⁽²⁾ The connection between 20,11–15 and 21,1–8 is duly emphasized by, e.g., U. MELL, *Neue Schöpfung. Eine traditionsgeschichtliche und exegetische Studie zu einem soteriologischen Grundsatz paulinischer Theologie* (BZNW 56; Berlin – New York 1989) 127–129.

were thrown into the lake of fire. ^b This is the second death, the lake of fire; ^{15a} and anyone whose name was not found written in the book of life ^b was thrown into the lake of fire.

1. *The Narrative*

The report of John's vision in 20,11-15 is not straightforward. A reconstruction of the logical sequence of what happened would only select the following facts: John sees the great white throne and the one who sat on it (v. 11a); earth and heaven flee from God's presence (v. 11b); then John sees the dead standing before the throne (v. 12a); books are opened (v. 12b); also the book of life is opened (v. 12c); all are judged according to their works, as written in the books mentioned first (v. 12d); anyone whose name is not in the book of life (v. 15a) is thrown into the lake of fire (v. 15b).

One immediately sees that v. 12c, which adds another book and its opening, interrupts as it were the opening of the books (v. 12b) and the judgment proper (v. 12d). Yet the 'book of life' had to be mentioned because of what is stated in v. 15a: the absence of one's name in that book indicates the criterion for the punishment⁽³⁾. Furthermore, in vv. 11-12 two details are rather illustrative: see v. 11c (no place is found for earth and heaven) and v. 12a (great and small).

The inserted verses 13-14 provide the readers with postponed explicative information and new data, but also repetition. In vv. 13a and 13b John explains how the dead can be present before God's throne: the sea, Death and Hades have given up their dead; then v. 13c repeats the judgment⁽⁴⁾. In v. 14a John describes personified Death and Hades being thrown into the lake of fire; v. 14b adds the explanation that this lake of fire is 'the second death'. The insertion of v. 14a makes the punishment of the sinners in v. 15 become a replica of that of Death and Hades; consequently; verse 15 is no longer the climax of the narrative⁽⁵⁾.

⁽³⁾ G.K. BEALE, *The Book of Revelation* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids – Cambridge 1999) 1033, appropriately notes: 'As in 13,8 and 17,8 the "book of life" is introduced to bring attention to those excluded from it'.

⁽⁴⁾ Cf. AUNE, *Revelation*, 1081: 'The composition of this pericope is problematic'. On the order of vv. 12-13 see also pp. 1102 and 1124.

⁽⁵⁾ Not so BEALE, *Revelation*, 1037: (on v. 15) 'The note of final judgment is rung once more for emphasis'. For AUNE, *Revelation*, 1103, v. 15 is an 'appended clause', a 'redactional insertion into the final text'.

2. The Old Testament

As is well known Revelation must be interpreted by reference to the Old Testament and Jewish traditions. We omit a discussion of the intricate problem of which OT text and/or Greek translation John has been dependent. Nor can attention be given here to the number, age and interconnection of the Jewish (apocalyptic) traditions and to possible extrabiblical motifs⁽⁶⁾. Moreover, only the main Old Testament passages will be dealt with. Regarding 20,11-15 John is certainly influenced by the books of Ezekiel, Daniel and Isaiah.

Ezekiel. In Rev 20-22 John appears to follow the order of Ezek 37-48⁽⁷⁾. A fourfold structural parallelism can be noted⁽⁸⁾:

- the resurrection of the martyrs (and all Christians?) (Rev 20,4a),
the revival of the dry bones (Ezek 37,1-14);
- the messianic kingdom (Rev 20,4b-6),
the reunited kingdom governed by the messianic king David
(Ezek 37,15-28);
- the final battle against Gog and Magog (Rev 20,7-10),
the final battle against Gog of Magog (Ezek 38-39);
- the descent of the new Jerusalem (Rev 21,1-22,5),
the vision of the new Temple and the new Jerusalem (Ezek 40-48).

John's dependence on Ezekiel cannot be denied, even though no parallel can be found for the passage 20,11-15. However, not only in 20,7-10, but also already in chapter 19, John refers to Ezekiel's oracles against Gog. J. Lust notes that most probably the order of Ezek 37-39 was not yet stabilized during the period in which the book of Revelation was being composed. In the oldest manuscript of Ezekiel, i.e., the recently discovered Greek Papyrus 967 (late 2nd or early 3rd cent.), as well as in the best manuscript of the Vetus Latina, the Codex

⁽⁶⁾ For ample information and discussion of the Jewish traditions see, e.g., the recent major commentaries by Aune and Beale.

⁽⁷⁾ For the influence of Ezekiel on Revelation see A. VANHOYE, "L'utilisation du livre d'Ezéchiél dans l'Apocalypse", *Bib* 43 (1962) 436-473, and, especially for Rev 1; 4-5; 10 and 21-22, J.M. VOGELGESANG, *The Interpretation of Ezekiel in the Book of Revelation* (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation; Harvard University 1985). Vogelgesang highlights John's direct dependence on Ezekiel and, moreover, maintains that John modeled his work on that of Ezekiel (see, e.g., pp. 71-72).

⁽⁸⁾ Cf. J. LUST, "The Order of the Final Events in Revelation and in Ezekiel", *L'Apocalypse johannique et l'Apocalyptique dans le Nouveau Testament* (ed. J. LAMBRECHT) (BETL 53; Leuven 1980) 179-183; ID., "Ezekiel 36-40 in the Oldest Greek Manuscript", *CBQ* 43 (1981) 517-533; VOGELGESANG, *Interpretation*, 64-66; BEALE, *Revelation*, 1012.

Wirceburgensis, chapter 37 follows chapters 38–39. This arrangement would provide an even more striking general parallelism between Rev 19,17–20,10 (battle against the two beasts and the dragon) and Ezek 38–39 (final battle against Gog of Magog), and between Rev 20,11–15 (judgment after resurrection) and Ezek 37 (revival of the dry bones)⁽⁹⁾. Yet even without an appeal to this different order, John's dependence on Ezekiel remains certain⁽¹⁰⁾. The discrepancies, more specifically the distinction between a first and second resurrection and the millennial kingdom in Rev 20, may be due to John's dependence on later traditions and to his own creativity.

Daniel. The throne and the one who sits on it have already been mentioned in Rev 4,2 and 5,7. In 20,11 the adjectives 'great and white' are added. The throne here is the majestic judgment seat and without a doubt, like in 4,2 and 5,7, it is God who sits on it (not the Lamb). In 20,11a and 12b (12d) a reference to Dan 7,9–10 must be assumed: in both instances a throne is spoken of; God (in Daniel: 'an Ancient One') takes his throne; in Daniel the throne is qualified by 'fiery flames', in Rev 20,11 by 'great white'; the books are opened. The presence of these three parallels (or four, if the resemblance between 'fiery flames' and 'great white' is accepted) cannot be accidental.

Moreover, in Dan 12,1 the author says that 'everyone who is found written in the book' will be delivered and in 12,2 a resurrection is dealt with: many will awake, 'some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt'. The conjunction of these two elements in Rev 20,12c.15a (book) and 13ab (resurrection) points to a conscious allusion on the part of John. The book in Dan 12,1 becomes 'the book of life' in Rev 20,12c.15a (cf. the same phrase in 3,5; 13,8 and 17,8). 'The books in Daniel 7 [v. 10] focus on the evil deeds of the end-time persecutor of God's people for which he will be judged. The book in Dan 12,1–2 also concerns the end time, but is an image of redemption: those written in that book will be given life, but those excluded from it will suffer final judgment' ⁽¹¹⁾.

⁽⁹⁾ Cf. LUST, "Final Events", 181–183. Lust guesses that John knew both editions of Ezekiel. See the balanced evaluation of this hypothesis by VOGELGESANG, *Interpretation*, 65, n. 87.

⁽¹⁰⁾ One more reason is given by AUNE, *Revelation*, 1104: 'Since the names God and Magog occur only rarely in Jewish apocalyptic literature, John has very likely derived these code names directly from Ezekiel'.

⁽¹¹⁾ BEALE, *Revelation*, 1032. On the different categories of heavenly books in apocalyptic literature, see VOGELGESANG, *Interpretation*, 318–323.

Isaiah. The description in Rev 20,11bc ('the earth and the heaven fled from his presence and no place was found for them') announces what will become the main theme of 21,1-8 (see especially vv. 1ab,4d and 5b). The new creation motif in Rev 21 clearly refers to texts of the Deutero- and Trito-Isaiah, mainly to Isa 65,17-20. What is said in Rev 20,11bc functions as a preparation to this utilization of Isaiah.

3. *Text in Context*

Climax. The passage Rev 20,11-15 forms the third and last part of the final judgment. In 19,11-21 Christ's victory over the beast and the false prophet is narrated; the two are thrown into the lake of fire (19,20). In 20,1-10 the victory over the dragon — 'who is the Devil and Satan' (20,2) — is indicated after the millennial kingdom. It is the outcome of the final battle of Satan together with Gog and Magog; the devil is thrown into the lake of fire. In 20,11-15 the dead are judged according to their works; Death and Hades are thrown into the lake of fire, as well as anyone whose name is not found written in the book of life.

The climactic nature of this vision should not go unnoticed: the great white throne and God himself as judge (v. 11a); the cosmic dissolution (v. 11bc); the 'general' resurrection (v. 13ab); the standing of the dead, great and small, before the throne (v. 12); the judgment itself (vv. 12bcd and 13c); the removal of Death and Hades (v. 14a); the outcome of the judgment (v. 15). G.K. Beale's comment on 20,11a (cf. 4,2 and 5,7) is to the point: 'The scene [of chs. 4-5] is repeated here to signify the consummate judgment, to which all previous judgments pointed and which is the climax of them all' ⁽¹²⁾.

Annihilation? The expression 'lake of fire' occurs six times in Revelation: see 19,20 (first scene: beast and false prophet); 20,10 (second scene: dragon); 20,14a (third scene: Death and Hades); 20,14b (third scene: this lake is the 'second death'); 20,15b (third scene: unbelieving mortals); 21,8 (sinners). One could be tempted to interpret the throwing of Death and Hades into the lake of fire as pointing to their complete annihilation, all the more so since 21,4b says that 'death will be no more'. Does then the same perhaps apply to the sinners who are thrown into the lake of fire? For that lake is called the 'second death' and one might argue that by definition death means non-

⁽¹²⁾ Ibid., 1031.

existence⁽¹³⁾. Most probably, however, this is not what John is thinking.

In 19,20 we read: 'These two [beast and false prophet] were thrown alive into the lake of fire that burns with sulfur' and in 20,10 the portrayal becomes even more explicit: 'And the devil ... was thrown into the lake of fire and sulfur, where the beast and the false prophet were, and they will be tormented day and night forever and ever'. There seems to be no reason to believe that according to John the lake of fire for unbelievers means annihilation rather than the permanent torment experienced by the devil. Moreover, it is not to be excluded that personified Death and Hades suffer that identical judgment, since they may be taken as evil spirits, agents of the devil. What is indicated in 20,15 about unbelievers is expanded in 21,8 by means of a list of sinners. John concludes: 'their place will be in the lake that burns with fire and sulfur, which is the second death'. No mention is made of the end of the burning fire and no mention of the annihilation of those who are in the lake. A passage such as 14,9-11 no doubt reveals John's conviction regarding the eternal punishment of 'those who worship the beast and its image' (v. 9): 'the smoke of their torment goes up forever and ever. There is no rest day or night' for those people (v. 11).

General Judgment? A first impression could be that the vision in 20,11-15 deals with the general judgment. The dead are present, 'great and small'. Since 'all' (ἕκαστος; each person) are judged according to their deeds, one thinks of the books in which the good and evil works of all mortals are recorded. Before the judgment a resurrection has taken place: sea, Death and Hades have given up their dead⁽¹⁴⁾. One almost spontaneously thinks of a 'neutral'

⁽¹³⁾ On second death see P.-M. BOGAERT, "La 'seconde mort' à l'époque des Tannaïm", *Vie et survie dans les civilisations orientales* (Acta orientalia Belgica 3; Leuven 1983) 199-207; AUNE, *Revelation*, 1091-1093: 'The Egyptian significance of second death and the lake of fire, i.e., complete and total destruction, cannot be meant in Revelation, as Rev 14:9-11 and 20:10 make clear. Rather [...] *eternal torment* is signified, so that what we have is an adaptation of Egyptian underworld mythology to Judeo-Christian tradition' (p. 1093).

⁽¹⁴⁾ Cf. R. BAUCKHAM, "Resurrection as Giving Back: A Traditional Image of Resurrection in the Pseudepigrapha and the Apocalypse of John", *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation* (ed. J.H. CHARLESWORTH – C.A. EVANS) (JSPE.S 14; Sheffield 1993) 269-291. Not so, e.g., H. GIESEN, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes* (RNT; Regensburg 1997) 448: 'Von einer Auferstehung ist aber auch hier keine Rede'. According to J. ROLOFF, "Weltgericht

resurrection like the one mentioned in Dan 12,1-2, a resurrection of the dead as a precondition to be present at the judgment. Eternal life and eternal punishment are the alternatives after the judgment according to anyone's works⁽¹⁵⁾.

Yet text and context force us to correct this initial picture. If with 20,11-15 John means the 'second resurrection' — but the expression is not used — one must not forget what he has written in 20,4-6: the martyrs (cf. 6,9-10), probably all Christians, come to life before the millennium; this is the first resurrection. The rest of the dead do not come to life before the end of the millennium. Are, in John's opinion, the still living future martyrs (and other Christians) also standing before the throne of judgment (v. 12a)? This is not evident.

The question arises whether the second resurrection of v. 13, suggested by the first mentioned in vv. 5-6, could be that of the unbelievers alone and whether the books (v. 12b) only contain their evil works⁽¹⁶⁾ and have to be properly distinguished from the book of life (v. 12c) in which the names of the believers are written (v. 15a). This view is supported by the fact that in 20,11-15 attention appears to be given to punitive judgment alone, not to reward and salvation⁽¹⁷⁾. What John narrates here seems to be different from the twofold judgment mentioned in 11,18: 'the time for judging the dead, for

und Weltvollendung in der Offenbarung des Johannes, *Weltgericht und Weltvollendung*. Zukunftsbilder im Neuen Testament (ed. H. KLAUCK) (QD 150; Freiburg – Basel – Wien 1994) 106-127, John avoids the mention of a resurrection in 20,14, because some enthusiastic believers proclaim that the resurrection has already taken place (cf. 2 Tim 2,17-18). But such a supposition cannot but remain highly hypothetical.

⁽¹⁵⁾ Cf. BEALE, *Revelation*, 1032: 'That John sees "the dead, great and small, standing before the throne" assumes that the last, great resurrection of the unrighteous and the righteous has finally taken place'.

⁽¹⁶⁾ The expression 'according to ... works' of vv. 12d and 13c is also present in 2,23 and equally refers to evil works. Yet see AUNE, *Revelation*, 1102: 'The plural [books] in both Dan 7:10 and here [Rev 20,12b and d] probably reflects the early Jewish tradition of *two* heavenly books, one for recording the deeds of the righteous and the other for recording the deeds of the wicked'. One may doubt that this is still so in 20,12b and d.

⁽¹⁷⁾ Cf. ROLOFF, "Weltgericht und Weltvollendung", 126: 'Im Gegensatz zur sonstigen urchristlichen Tradition spricht die Offenbarung nicht von einer Konfrontation der Glieder der Heilsgemeinde mit Gott bzw. Christus im Weltgericht. Vor allem die Richterfunktion des Parusie-Christus gegenüber den Seinen fällt aus'. The explanation by AUNE, *Revelation*, 1104, does not focus on this problem.

rewarding your servants ... both small and great, and for destroying those who destroy the earth' ⁽¹⁸⁾.

II. The New Creation and New Jerusalem (21,1-8)

This is the NRSV translation of Rev 21,1-8:

^{1a} Then I saw a new heaven and a new earth; ^b for the first heaven and the first earth had passed away, ^c and the sea was no more. ^{2a} And I saw the holy city, the new Jerusalem, ^b coming down out of heaven from God, ^c prepared as a bride adorned for her husband. ^{3a} And I heard a loud voice from the throne saying, ^b 'See, the home of God is among mortals. ^c He will dwell with them as their God, ^d they will be his peoples, ^e and God himself will be with them. ^{4a} he will wipe every tear from their eyes. ^b Death will be no more; ^c mourning and crying and pain will be no more, ^d for the first things have passed away'. ^{5a} And the one who was seated on the throne said, ^b 'See, I am making all things new'. ^c Also he said, ^d 'Write this, for these words are trustworthy and true'. ^{6a} Then he said to me, ^b 'It is done! ^c I am the Alpha and the Omega, the beginning and the end. ^d To the thirsty I will give water as a gift from the spring of the water of life. ^{7a} Those who conquer will inherit these things, ^b and I will be their God ^c and they will be my children. ^{8a} But as for the cowardly, the faithless, the polluted, the murderers, the fornicators, the sorcerers, the idolaters, and all liars, their place will be in the lake that burns with fire and sulfur, ^b which is the second death'.

1. *The Narrative*

In 21,1 John continues his report of visions by means of καὶ εἶδον: see 20,11.12 (cf. also, e.g., 19,11.17.19; 20,1.4). In 21,2 this verbal form is repeated again, but no longer at the beginning of the sentence. The opposition between 20,11-15 and 21,1-8 is complete: definitive judgment on the one hand and new creation (or creation's renewal) on the other. Yet literary connections can easily be shown: the throne (21,3) and the one who is seated on it (21,5) are still there in this new vision (cf. 20,11a for the previous vision). Moreover, the content of 21,1b (heaven and earth) reminds the reader of 20,11bc, and that of 21,8 (lake of fire, second death) refers back to 20,14 and 15b.

⁽¹⁸⁾ This means that the expression τοὺς μικροὺς καὶ τοὺς μεγάλους in 11,18 points to the servants while in 20,12a the similar expression τοὺς μεγάλους καὶ τοὺς μικροὺς indicates those thrown in the fire (cf. 20,15b).

The passage is best divided into two units: vv. 1-4 and vv. 5-8⁽¹⁹⁾. In the first unit John reports what he sees (twice καὶ εἶδον in vv. 1-2) and what he hears (καὶ ἤκουσα in vv. 3-4). Verse 4d ('for the first things have passed away [ἀπῆλθον]') forms an inclusion with verse 1b ('for the first heaven and the first earth had passed away [ἀπῆλθον]'). In vv. 5-8 God ('the one who was seated on the throne') speaks in the first person singular. This second unit does not begin with 'I heard'; God takes the initiative. The end of the unit (v. 8b) repeats the identification of the lake of fire with the 'second death', which was already emphasized in 20,14b. As stated above, the whole of 21,8 recalls 20,15.

John sees a new cosmos; the dimensions point to completeness: heaven and earth and also what they contain (v. 1a; cf. 'all' in v. 5b). The repetitive character of v. 1b and the additional note on the sea⁽²⁰⁾ of v. 1c have already been pointed out. John's attention, however, is not so much cosmic. The focus lies on the 'holy city, the new Jerusalem' (v. 2a) which comes down 'out of heaven from God' (v. 2b). One wonders whether in John's vision much space is left for any reality that is not the holy city. Perhaps the new heaven and the new earth are just the background for Jerusalem⁽²¹⁾. The holy city has been prepared 'as a bride adorned for her husband' (v. 2c). She represents the universal church of the end time. The 'loud voice from the throne' (v. 3a) explains what the 'coming down' of Jerusalem means. Is this voice that of one of the elders or one of the four living creatures (cf. ch. 5)? Or is it perhaps the voice of God who, in the third person singular, reflects upon his own actions? This remains uncertain.

A more literal translation of v. 3bcde may be helpful here:

⁽¹⁹⁾ A. VÖGTLE, *Das Buch mit den sieben Siegeln*. Die Offenbarung des Johannes in Auswahl gedeutet (Freiburg – Basel – Wien 1981) 163, divides the passage into a 'Vision' (21,1-2) and an 'Audition' (21,3-8); cf. MELL, *Neue Schöpfung*, 129-130; AUNE, *Revelation*, 1112-1113: vv. 1-2.3-4.5-8. P. HIRSCHBERG, *Das eschatologische Israel*. Untersuchungen zum Gottesvolkverständnis der Johannesoffenbarung (WMANT 84; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1999) 205, 223-224, sees a concentric structure in 21,1-5 of which verses 2-3 constitute the center.

⁽²⁰⁾ For John the 'sea' seems to symbolize a demonic realm of evil. For other possible nuances, cf. BEALE, *Revelation*, 1042-1043.

⁽²¹⁾ Cf. VÖGTLE, *Das Buch mit den sieben Siegeln*, 172; D. GEORGI, "Die Visionen vom himmlischen Jerusalem in Apk 21 und 22", *Kirche* (FS. G. Bornkamm [eds. D. LÜHRMANN – G. STRECKER] Tübingen 1980) 351-372, 354-355.

^{3b} Behold, the tent of God [will be] with men, ^c and he will put up his tent with them, ^d and they will be his peoples (²²) ^e and God himself will be with them, their God (²³).

In what the voice announces in 21,3-4 no more attention is given to the comparison of v. 2c. Three elements can be distinguished: (1) that city is God's tent (σκηνή) among 'men' (ἄνθρωποι); God will put up his tent (σκηνώσει) among them (v. 3bc); (2) this divine dwelling results in a reciprocal relationship: they will be God's peoples (λαοί) and God himself will be with them as their God (v. 3de: the covenant formula); (3) the whole of verse 4 then indicates what God through this 'newness' will bring about; he will take away all suffering and even death.

In v. 5a 'the one who is seated' renders the same Greek term as 'the one who sat' in 5,1 (καθήμενον). Three times a verb of 'saying' introduces a direct speech of God: καὶ εἶπεν (v. 5a), καὶ λέγει (v. 5c) and καὶ εἶπέν μοι (v. 6a) (²⁴). The third and last time God's speaking is much longer (see vv. 6b-8b) (²⁵). Therefore, verses 5-8 are best divided into v. 5ab, v. 5cd and vv. 6-8. (1) By means of 'see, I am making all things new' in v. 5b God refers to the new things mentioned in vv. 1-4 and highlights his personal involvement (cf. v. 2b: 'from God'). The prophetic present 'I am making' refers to the end time. (2) By his command to write as well as by its motivation in v. 5d God underscores the validity of what he said in v. 5b (and, through v. 5b, of course, of the entire content in vv. 1-4) (²⁶).

(²²) One could hesitate between plural and singular of this word, both readings being supported by good manuscripts. Yet 'peoples' should be given preference because it is the more difficult reading.

(²³) For a discussion of the numerous variants regarding 'their God', see AUNE, *Revelation*, 1110-1111, and B.M. METZGER, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (Stuttgart ²1994) 688-689: '... After considerable discussion the Committee concluded that the least unsatisfactory procedure was to print the text of A, but to enclose the words αὐτῶν θεός within square brackets' (p. 689).

(²⁴) Cf. BEALE, *Revelation*, 1057: 'The fluctuation of tenses in vv. 5-6 from 'he said' to 'he says' and back again to 'he said' is a feature of John's visionary style, in which he can refer to what he has heard in a past vision but then, at the same time, use the present tense in the narration for the purpose of vividness'. According to GEORGI, "Visionen", 359, n. 32, v. 5cd constitutes a later addition which had its origin 'als eine bewundernde Bemerkung eines Abschreibers oder Lesers'. This is hardly convincing.

(²⁵) Vv. 6b-8b are better taken as one coherent speech-unit and not, with AUNE, *Revelation*, 1114, as part of a collection of seven sayings to be found in vv. 5-8.

(²⁶) Rev 21,5d functions much like 19,9, a verse that is a formal confirmation

(3) The perfect tense in the exclamation 'it is done!' (γέγονον) in v. 6b confirms that the prophecies will certainly be fulfilled. Then, in v. 6c, God defines himself and in this solemn way points to his enduring sovereignty: 'I am the Alpha and the Omega, the beginning and the end'. While using it in vv. 3b-4a ('men', 'peoples', 'their eyes') God does not use the plural in vv. 6d-7abc; he speaks of the believer in the singular. In v. 6d, just as in v. 4abc, the blessings of salvation are pointed out figuratively: the thirsty person will receive living water from God without payment. The term δώρεον — 'by way of gift' — at the end of the sentence is clearly not without emphasis (cf. 22,17). The inclusive NRSV translation has eliminated the singular in v. 7. A literal rendering is needed for the discussion:

^{7a} He who conquers will inherit these things, ^b and I will be his God ^c and he will be my son.

It is possible that in 'he who conquers' the necessary condition is alluded to: one has to conquer in order to get the inheritance, i.e., the whole newness. In the concluding promise of all seven letters that condition of 'conquering' has been repeated (2,7.11.17.26; 3,5.12.21). In v. 7bc the well-known adoption formula (cf. 2 Sam 7,14) is quoted freely. Then, in v. 8 God's last words rather unexpectedly return to the exclusion from salvation (cf. 20,15). 'All liars' ⁽²⁷⁾ comes last and concludes the preceding seven categories. Does this list, therefore, in the first place refer to cowardly, unfaithful, compromising, insincere believers? If so, verse 8 contains an impressive warning since 'their lot will be in the lake that burns with fire and sulfur, which is the second death'. Yet this is not certain; all kinds of pagan unbelievers could be meant as well.

2. The Old Testament

It would seem that the main Old Testament impact on John in 22,1-8 comes from three different writings: Ezekiel, Isaiah and 2 Samuel.

of the marriage passage 19,7-8 (cf. 21,2c). AUNE, *Revelation*, 1126, comments: Rev 21,5d '...is the last of several commands to write that apparently have the entire composition in view (Rev 1:11, 19; 21:5; cf. 10:4) rather than just partial texts that are the objects of the commands to write in 14:13 and 19:9'. But can such a comprehensive reference be assumed for 21,5d?

⁽²⁷⁾ According to BEALE, *Revelation*, 1060, the expression points to 'those whose Christian profession is betrayed by compromising behavior and false doctrine'. The lists in 21,8.27 and 22,15 are all three concluded with 'liars'.

Ezekiel. John's dependence on Ezek 37–48 regarding the order in Rev 20–22 has already been discussed on pp. 365–366. His creative modification of Ezekiel concerning God's presence in the new Jerusalem will be dealt with in the following paragraph. For his use of the covenant formula in Rev 21,3 John is most probably directly influenced by Ezek 37,27⁽²⁸⁾. Ezek 37,27 (LXX) reads:

^{27a} My dwelling place (κατασκήνωμα) shall be with (ἐν) them; ^b and I will be their God, ^c and they shall be my people.

The fact that Ezek 37–48 influences John in the global structuring of his last chapters as well as the presence of the term κατασκήνωμα in 37,27a (cf. σκηνή in Rev 21,3b and σκηνώσει in 21,3c)⁽²⁹⁾ should convince us that John depends on this particular rendering of the often quoted formula and not on Lev 26,12 or Zech 2,14–15⁽³⁰⁾. What are the changes effected by John? He duplicates the first clause (Ezek 37,27a): 'Behold, the tent of God [will be] with men, and he will put his tent with them' (v. 3bc). Then John adds: 'and they will be his peoples and God himself will be with them, their God' (v. 3de). For John the new Jerusalem is not only a restored Israel but comprises all Christians: see 'men' (v. 3b), the plural 'peoples' (v. 3d; compare with 'my people' in Ezek 37,27c)⁽³¹⁾ and 'they, them, they' (v. 3de). This rewriting in v. 3bc may have caused the inversion in v. 3d and e as well as the stylistically less happy alterations in v. 3e: first 'they will be his peoples' and then 'God himself will be with them, their God' (compare

⁽²⁸⁾ Cf. VOGELGESANG, *Interpretation*, 81–86.

⁽²⁹⁾ The only other place in the book of Revelation where noun and verb occur together (and in the same order) is 13,6: the beast utters blasphemies against God, 'his name and his dwelling, that is, those who dwell in heaven'.

⁽³⁰⁾ Zech 2,15 has the plural: 'and many nations shall join themselves to the Lord in that day, and shall be my people; and I will dwell in the midst of you [= daughter of Zion]'. Cf. AUNE, *Revelation*, 1123–1124. Recently HIRSCHBERG, *Israel*, 235–243, defends John's dependence in 21,2–3.23–25 on Zech 2,5–17. Yet in Zechariah the covenant formula is less clear; moreover, John may have taken the plural λαοί from 7,9 (cf. also σκηνώσει in 7,15).

⁽³¹⁾ Cf. VOGELGESANG, *Interpretation*, 84: the plural 'peoples' is 'a slight change in detail creating a major difference in interpretation'. In his comment on Rev 7,15–17 BEALE, *Revelation*, 440–441, writes: 'The application of Ezek. 37:27 to the church is striking [...] Ezekiel 37 was a prophecy uniquely applicable to ethnic or theocratic Israel in contrast to the nations, yet now John understands it as fulfilled in the church'. Beale calls this a 'reversed application of OT prophecy'. Compare Rev 21,3bc with 7,15c; 21,4a with 7,17c; and 21,6d with 7,16a.17b.

Ezek 37,27b and c)⁽³²⁾. The 'covenant of peace' or 'everlasting covenant' of Ezek 37,26 is not mentioned nor, of course, the 'sanctuary in the midst of them' of 37,26.28. Yet the covenant formula of 37,27 is prominent, in its edited form, i.e., without any particularism.

Isaiah. Two specific passages of the book of Isaiah appear to have influenced John in 21,1-8, namely Isa 65,17-20⁽³³⁾ and 25,7-8. In the first passage five parallelisms can be pointed out; they stand, moreover, in the same sequence: (1) 'I am about to create new heavens and a new earth' (65,17a^[34]; cf. Rev 21,1a; in 21,5b God himself radicalizes and universalizes this vision: ἰδοὺ καινὰ ποιῶ πάντα); (2) 'the former things shall not be remembered or come to mind' (65,17b; cf. Rev 21,1b); (3) Jerusalem is mentioned in 65,18-19 (cf. Rev 21,2); (4) 'no more shall the sound of weeping be heard in it or the cry of distress' (65,19a; cf. Rev 21,4a); (5) (possible) 'no more shall there be' (65,20a; cf. Rev. 21,4b and c)⁽³⁵⁾.

The second passage contains two allusions: (1) 'he [the Lord] will swallow up death forever' (25,8a; cf. Rev. 21,4b); (2) 'then the Lord God will wipe away the tears from all faces' (25,8b; cf. Rev 21,4a). Here, the order is inverted, yet in both Isaiah and Revelation the texts are found together. The disappearance of sorrow is brought about by the abolition of death. As usual John does not quote literally; but in v. 4ab, too, his dependence on both Isa 25,8 and 65,19-20 can hardly be doubted⁽³⁶⁾.

2 Samuel. In Rev 21,7bc the adoption formula is cited. In 2 Sam 7, the Lord, through the prophet Nathan, explains to David that not he

⁽³²⁾ U. VANNI, "Linguaggio, simboli ed esperienza mistica nel libro dell'Apocalisse. II", *Greg* 79 (1998) 473-501, translates 21,3e: 'ed egli, Iddio con loro, sarà il loro Dio' (p. 478), 'con una punteggiatura che salvi il valore dell'espressione e il parallelismo con quella che precede' (n. 14). But see also our n. 23.

⁽³³⁾ Cf. J. VAN RUITEN, "The Intertextual Relationship between Isaiah 65,17-20 and Revelation 21,1-5b", *EstBtbl* 51 (1993) 473-510.

⁽³⁴⁾ The Septuagint translates: 'For there will be the new heaven and the new earth'. Both here and in Rev 21,1a the verb 'create' is absent. However, according to MELL, *Neue Schöpfung*, 133-134, John does not directly depend on this version. A 'traditionsgeschichtlicher Zusammenhang zu äthHen 91,16' is postulated (p. 133). Such a possible dependence, however, remains difficult to prove.

⁽³⁵⁾ For this last possible parallelism, see BEALE, *Revelation*, 1050: the formula 'is derived from Isa. 65:19-20'.

⁽³⁶⁾ Cf. VAN RUITEN, "Intertextual Relationship" for more possible allusions, e.g., Isa 43,19 (a new thing); 52,1 (Jerusalem holy city); 49,18 and 61,10 (bride). See his conclusions on pp. 508-510 regarding the lexical and thematic level of the Old Testament influence.

but his son will build 'a house for his name', a temple. God will establish the throne of his kingdom forever (cf. 7,13). Then comes the adoption promise: 'I will be a father to him, and he shall be a son to me' (7,14). One can hardly prove that John directly depends on this passage from 2 Samuel. The adoption formula is too familiar for that. The rewriting of 'a father to him' (αὐτῷ εἰς πατέρα) and 'a son to me' (μοι εἰς υἱόν) into a nominative without εἰς does not yield much of a difference in sense. Instead of 'father' in v. 7b John writes 'God'. This may be under the influence of v. 3 where 'God' is repeated in the covenant formula three times. Some authors, moreover, assume that John avoids 'father' which noun he reserves for use by the unique son Jesus (cf. 1,6; 2,28; 3,5.21; 14,1)⁽³⁷⁾.

3. Text in Context

Creation? In Rev 21,1-8 God's initiative is very much emphasized. The language surely suggests a completely new beginning and no continuity with what existed in the past. The first things have passed away; the new reality comes from heaven, from God. Yet what appears is a new 'heaven', a new 'earth'; what comes down is a new 'Jerusalem'. The terms themselves seem to betray a persisting relation between old and new. The new is 'an identifiable counterpart' of the old and 'a renewal of it' ⁽³⁸⁾. According to 21,5b God is not replacing the old but 'making all things new'. This points to transformation rather than to an outright new creation of a totally different reality ⁽³⁹⁾. It would seem that by the symbolic language of 21,1-2 John above all refers to the so-called preexistent salvation which he 'sees' as coming down from heaven. By preexistence and heavenly origin he emphasizes the certainty of God's eschatological salvation and thus encourages his endangered addressees ⁽⁴⁰⁾.

The New Jerusalem. The holy city comes down out of heaven from God (21,2ab; cf. 21,10 and already 3,12). The cube form of the city, her

⁽³⁷⁾ See GIESEN, *Offenbarung*, 458 (with reference to other authors); BEALE, *Revelation*, 1058.

⁽³⁸⁾ BEALE, *Revelation*, 1040: 'Indeed, καινός ... refers predominantly to a change in quality or essence rather than something new that has never previously been in existence'.

⁽³⁹⁾ Cf. G.Z. HEIDE, "What is New about the New Heaven and the New Earth? A Theology of Creation from Revelation 21 and 2 Peter 3", *JETS* 40 (1997) 37-56.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ See MELL, *Neue Schöpfung*, 134-135.

enormous dimensions and the precious stones as building materials underline the grandiose character of that Jerusalem from above (cf. 21,11-21).

Jerusalem is prepared as a bride adorned for her husband⁽⁴¹⁾. That husband is the Lamb (see 21,9: the interpreting angel will show him [John] 'the bride, the wife of the Lamb'). In 19,7-9 the marriage of the Lamb and his bride is announced. The 'bride has made herself ready; to her it has been granted to be clothed with fine linen, bright and pure' (19,7c-8a). John explains: 'for the fine linen is the righteous deeds of the saints' (19,8b). The perfect bride is the church of the end time, the new Israel, represented by the twelve apostles of the Lamb (21,13-14), as well as consisting of 'the peoples' (21,3), 'the nations' (21,24-26 and 22,2; and cf. ch. 7)⁽⁴²⁾. In his recent monograph Peter Hirschberg shows convincingly, it would seem, how the eschatological people of God preserves its continuity with the historical Israel, and how it is open to all peoples. In Revelation one should not find the idea of substitution of Israel by the church⁽⁴³⁾.

Through her magnitude the new Jerusalem fills, one would say, the new heaven and the new earth. There seems to be no room for anything else. God's presence in that city is emphasized (21,3bc)⁽⁴⁴⁾. In the new Jerusalem there will be no temple, 'for its temple is the Lord God and the Lamb' (21,22). Ezekiel's new temple is, as it were, replaced by the whole of the new Jerusalem. 'The city has no need of sun or moon to shine on it, for the glory of God is its light, and its lamp is the Lamb'

⁽⁴¹⁾ Cf. K.E. MILLER, "The Nuptial Eschatology of Revelation 19-22", *CBQ* 60 (1998) 301-318.

⁽⁴²⁾ Cf. A. VÖGTLE, "'Dann sah ich einen neuen Himmel und eine neue Erde...'" (Apk 21,1). Zur kosmischen Dimension neutestamentlicher Eschatologie", *Glaube und Eschatologie* (FS W.G. Kümmel [eds. E. GRÄSSER – O. MERK] Tübingen 1985) 303-333: a 'geradezu provozierende Identifizierung von Frau und Stadt' functions 'als Sinnbild der vollerlösten Heilsgemeinde' (pp. 327-328).

⁽⁴³⁾ Besides 2,9 and 3,9, HIRSCHBERG, *Israel*, analyses chapters 7 and 21-22. He coins his basic insight as follows: 'Heilsgeschichtlich unterscheidet der Seher ... zwischen Juden und Heiden, soteriologisch ist jeder Unterschied aufgehoben' (p. 194). Moreover, John's emphasis on the twelve tribes (see 7,4-8 and 21,12-13) may point to his hope of the salvation of the whole of Israel.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ Cf. R.H. GUNDRY, "The New Jerusalem: People as Place, not Place for People", *NT* 29 (1987) 254-264: 'The New Jerusalem is a dwelling place, to be sure; but it is God's dwelling place in the saints rather than their dwelling place on earth. The new earth ... is the saints' dwelling place' (p. 256).

(21,23; cf. 22,5). God's dwelling 'with men' cannot but produce a covenantal relationship: they are his peoples, he is their God (21,3de).

This eschatological salvation is further explained negatively: no more grief and groaning, no more death (21,4abc and cf. the exclusion sayings of 21,8,27; 22,3a), but then also positively: the gift of water (21,6d), inheritance (21,7a), sonship (21,7bc) and, of course, God's radiant glory itself (21,22-26), as well as the river of the water of life (22,1-5ab). The believers 'will reign forever and ever' (22,5c; cf., e.g., 20,6: they are 'priests of God and of Christ' and they 'will reign')⁽⁴⁵⁾.

Covenant and Adoption. Are the covenant formula (21,3de) and the adoption formula (21,7bc) without a mutual connection? Just as in the alleged fragment 2 Cor 6,14-7,1, so also in Rev 21,1-8 both formulae are employed in the same context and in a similar interrupted sequence. The two formulae appear to be intended as complementary promises; they interpret one another, but adoption appears to be more than covenant. Compare 2 Cor 6,16d with Rev 21,3de (covenant), and 2 Cor 6,17d-18b with Rev 21,7bc (adoption). In 2 Cor 6 Paul inserts allusions to other Old Testament texts; he uses introductory expressions which show that he wants to cite; the covenant formula is most probably cited from Lev 26,12, not from Ezek 37,27; in 6,18 he expands the last clause of the adoption formula: 'and you will be sons and daughters to me'⁽⁴⁶⁾.

John does not formally introduce his references; as a matter of fact he does not quote properly. Within the context of 21,1-8 the adoption formula probably has a climactic function. No longer the voice and the third person as for the covenant formula, but God himself speaks in the first person singular. Moreover, the collective plural of 'men' and 'peoples' gives way to a seemingly more direct and engaging singular: the individual is addressed. Not only divine presence and gifts and inheritance are offered, not only overwhelming riches, but a filial relationship with God.

God and Lamb. The passage 21,1-8 is remarkably theocentric. In vv. 1-4 God is explicitly mentioned three times. He is the only agent; he makes all things new (cf. v. 5b). This is highlighted by the words of

⁽⁴⁵⁾ In 7,14-17 a number of motifs are anticipated. See especially v. 15: 'the one who is seated on the throne' (cf. 21,5a) and σκηνώσει (cf. 21,3c); v. 17: the 'springs of the water of life' (cf. 21,6d) and 'God will wipe away every tear from their eyes' (cf. 21,4a).

⁽⁴⁶⁾ Cf. J. LAMBRECHT, *Second Corinthians* (Sacra Pagina; Collegeville 1999) 123-125.

the voice in vv. 3b-4d. Moreover, in vv. 5-8 the Lord God himself proceeds to speak in the first person⁽⁴⁷⁾. He does it three times with much decision and authority and in a solemn, climactic way. He points out his identity and sovereignty. One can scarcely avoid the impression that this intentional theocentrism might have caused the somewhat strange absence of the Lamb in vv. 1-8.

Nevertheless, 'husband' in 21,2c contains a reference to the Lamb. Moreover, immediately after 21,1-8 the Lamb is mentioned several times: 'the bride, the wife of the Lamb' (21,9); 'the twelve apostles of the Lamb' (21,14); 'its temple is the Lord God the Almighty and the Lamb' (21,22); 'the glory of God is its light and its lamp is the Lamb' (21,23); 'the throne of God and of the Lamb' (22,1). These five references appear to be a conscious clarification, almost a corrective⁽⁴⁸⁾. In 22,13 Christ applies to himself God's identification of 21,6c: 'I am the Alpha and the Omega ... the beginning and the end'.

III. The Last Two Visions

Why can Rev 20,11-15 and 21,1-8 be called the last two visions? What about 21,9-22,5? Just as in 17,1-3 one of the seven angels who had the bowls carries John away in the spirit into the wilderness, so also in 21,9-10 one of the seven angels who had the seven bowls full of the seven last plagues carries John away in the spirit to a great high mountain. In 17,3 John sees a woman sitting on a scarlet beast (Babylon, Rome) and in 21,10 he sees the holy city Jerusalem (the bride, the wife of the Lamb) coming down out of heaven from God. Just as in 17,4-18 so also in 21,11-22,5 the interpreting angel provides the explanation of what is seen by John. Strictly speaking, both passages, 17,1-18 and 21,9-22,5 are not visions; the first does not carry forward God's judgment of his enemies nor does the second complete

⁽⁴⁷⁾ Cf. GIESEN, *Offenbarung*, 456; AUNE, *Revelation*, 1125; BEALE, *Interpretation*, 1055: 'Verses 5 and 6 are only the second time in the Apocalypse where God is explicitly quoted. The first was in 1:8. Both there and here the title 'the Alpha and the Omega' occurs. That this title appears at the beginning and end of the book is fitting and cannot be coincidence. The placement heightens further the figurative point of the divine title, which mentions two polar opposites (first and last) to underscore that everything between the opposites is included: all the events narrated and portrayed between 1:8 and 21:6 lie under God's absolute sovereignty, as has all history prior to the writing of Revelation'.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ Compare also the role of Christ in the battle of 19,11-21: he is the 'King of kings and Lord of lords' (v. 16).

the definitive salvation of the saints⁽⁴⁹⁾. The last two visions in 20,11–21,8 contain the outcome of both the final judgment and victory which are depicted in 19,11–22,5⁽⁵⁰⁾.

What remains to be done is to summarize the main data of this climactic outcome and to present some hermeneutical reflections.

1. *The Final Outcome*

(1) Rev 20,11-15 contains the last scene of God's victory over his enemies. John sees the great white judgment seat and the one who is seated on it; the dead, great and small, are standing before the throne; the books are opened. Earth and heaven have fled from God's presence. Sea, Death and Hades have given up their dead. Then Death and Hades are thrown into the lake of fire; the same happened with those whose name is not written in the book of life.

In vv. 11-13 one spontaneously imagines a general resurrection or, if one takes into account the first resurrection mentioned in 20,5-6, at least the resurrection of the rest of the dead so that all the dead can be judged. One expects, therefore, the separation of the saints from the sinners; one looks for both reward and punishment. But the judgment in vv. 14-15 is one-sidedly negative; the focus is on 'the inhabitants of the earth, whose names have not been written in the book of life from the foundation of the world' (17,8). For all of them it is the ultimate catastrophe, the second death. This is, of course, not just information for the Christians; a hidden warning is also present. Yet the reader is tempted to ask: what happens to those whose names are written in that book? After all, that momentous throne pericope of 20,11-15 remains somewhat strange.

This reminds us of the compositional irregularities which are discussed above. After John has depicted the lot of the dragon, the beast and the false prophet, he does not want to omit the same destiny for Death and Hades. What in vv. 13-14 is said about sea, Death and Hades appears to be an insertion.

(2) The start of 21,1-8 is brusque. There is a kind of suspense at the end of 20,11-15. The final judgments took place, but what happened to

⁽⁴⁹⁾ Cf., e.g., BEALE, *Interpretation*, 1062: '21:9–22:5 is a recapitulation of the immediately preceding section of 21:1-8 that amplifies the picture there of God's consummate communion with his people and their consummate safety in the new creation'.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ Moreover, an inclusion is formed by 19,9-10 and 22,6-9.

the believers? Their resurrection does not seem alluded to; their reward is not depicted. The negative punitive vision of 20,11-15 requires, as it were, a positive victorious counterpart. In 21,1, without any form of transition, the vision of the new heaven and the new earth is introduced, utterly positive. A judgment of the righteous which would result in a just reward is not described. One has to wait until v. 3 before 'men' and 'peoples' are mentioned, but even then they are not called by one of their known names, e.g., 'those written in the book of life', 'followers of the Lamb' (cf. 14,4) or 'servants of God with a seal on their foreheads' (cf. 7,3). Yet the holy city which comes down out of heaven from God in 21,2 is the new Jerusalem; she is the bride. It would seem, however, that in 21,3-4 John does not further reflect on the marital image (in contrast with 19,7-8; Isa 52,10; 62,3-5). Attention goes to God's covenantal presence, not to the intimate marriage relationship. Jerusalem is the home of God; God dwells with 'men'. These 'men' are the inhabitants of that city. They are his 'peoples', the renewed Israel consisting of Jew and Gentile alike. The holy city, the new Jerusalem, is a metaphor for the church universal. In the eschaton the saints will be the bride adorned for her husband, the Lamb. In a climactic way, the definitive future is announced. The message has divine authentication. First a voice from the throne proclaims the universalistic covenant of God with the redeemed humankind. This means God's covenantal presence and, at the same time, the absence of mourning and pain, the immunity to first and second death.

Then, in 21,5-8, three times the Lord God himself validates the absolute victory that is announced. (a) He emphasizes that he is making all things new. (b) He stresses that his words are trustworthy and true. (c) He affirms that 'it is done!' ⁽⁵¹⁾ and refers to his sovereign, authoritative identity: he is the Alpha and the Omega, the beginning and the end (cf. 1,8). He confirms the free gift of living water and of the inheritance for the conqueror. And, at the very peak of this brief discourse, to the individual faithful servant God promises adoption, i.e., divine sonship: I will be his God and he will be my son. This is hardly only a metaphor which refers to God's special protection and care. No, in Christ, God's Son, his followers become sons and

⁽⁵¹⁾ The perfect γέγοναν (plural) reminds the reader of γέγονεν (singular) in 16,17: 'The seventh angel poured his bowl into the air, and a loud voice came out of the temple, from the throne, saying, "It is done!"' The creation of new Jerusalem comes after the destruction of great Babylon (see 16,18-21).

daughters of God, divinely renewed and transformed. Such an attractive, triumphant view of the eschatological future must bring encouragement to those who still suffer on earth. God himself, however, in a rather astonishing way, at once adds a severe warning: the place of the compromising unfaithful, the lot of sinners, will be in the lake of fire, which is the second death.

The compact vision of 21,1-8 is then further elaborated in 21,9-22,5 by the angel's expansive interpretation which, of course, maintains and even further heightens the climax.

2. Hermeneutical Reflections

There is hopefully no longer any need today to warn the alert reader against a literal, fundamentalist interpretation of the whole imagery of the last two visions. In this concluding paragraph attention will be given to three problematic items: the lake of fire, theocentrism and the expectation of an imminent end.

(1) In 21,4b it is said that (physical) death will be no more. This means its definitive disappearance and annihilation. The same may apply to the misery mentioned in v. 4a and 4c and to the inimical sea of v. 1c. But this is likely not the case as far as the first heaven and the first earth in v. 1b are concerned. John possibly sees the new heaven and new earth (v. 1a) as a renewal of the old, not as a completely new creation (cf. v. 5b). And what about all those thrown into the lake of fire: false prophet, beast and devil, as well as the people not written in the book of life? According to Revelation they do not appear to be annihilated. They will be tormented in hell forever; their damnation is eternal.

A number of apocalyptic data should be interpreted in due manner. Hell is not to be localized. Fire and bodily pain are not to be taken as real. Hell must be thought of as a state of complete frustration, absence of love, definite separation from God. Should hermeneutics go further? Nowadays, more than before and notwithstanding the traditional creed, critical Christians not only doubt the existence of devil and demons but also seriously ask themselves whether total lack of love in a human being will not end in his or her non-existence, a 'second death', and, moreover, how one can imagine a merciful God who in his justice condemns human beings, his creatures, to an everlasting doom. However, a study of Revelation alone can hardly endorse such radical criticisms⁽⁵²⁾.

⁽⁵²⁾ A conclusion such as that of T.F. GLASSON, "The Last Judgment — in Rev. 20 and Related Writings" *NTS* 28 (1982) 528-539, cannot be rejected: 'The

(2) Both the severe judgment in 20,11-15 and the extreme theocentrism in 21,1-8 could wrongly suggest the absence of human action and responsibility. As elsewhere in Revelation, the radical separation between bad and good appears to be fixed. One might suspect a sort of determinism, a certain predestination, in these visions. Moreover, in the book of Revelation little or nothing is said about the conversion of 'the inhabitants of the earth'. Time and again the absence of repentance is recorded⁽⁵³⁾. 'Let the evildoer still do evil, and the filthy still be filthy, and the righteous still do right, and the holy still be holy' (22,11).

John, however, is more nuanced. First of all, one should remember that in 20,11-21,8 John describes the end of history, i.e., final damnation and eternal salvation. Then changes will no longer be possible. Moreover, significant details in the text certainly point to human accountability. The dead will be judged according to their works (20,12d and 13c). One has to remain faithful and to conquer in order to receive the inheritance (21,7a). Before the end compromise, infidelity and all sorts of sin remain possible.

John's addressees are the Christians in Asia. The depiction of the future judgment is certainly also intended as warning and encouragement, as threat and exhortation during the present life on earth.

(3) What John announces in 20,11-20,8 — final judgments and ultimate blessings — is not seen in a distant future. After 21,9-22,5 the interpreting angel says to John: 'Do not seal up the words of the prophecy of this book; for the time is near' (22,10). In 22,12 Jesus speaks of his return: 'See, I am coming soon; my reward is with me, to repay according to everyone's work' (cf. 22,20). As is commonly assumed, in the book of Revelation the linear time-line of the prophecies is more than once interrupted by proleptic scenes (cf., e.g., 7,9-17; 11,16-18; 16,5-7). The future thus becomes present to some

conviction remains valid, that finally wrong will be righted, realities seen in their true light, the mysteries of life made plain; the conviction that we are responsible to God, and that his purpose to sum up all things in Christ will be fulfilled' (p. 528).

⁽⁵³⁾ R. BAUCKHAM, *The Climax of Prophecy*. Studies in the Book of Revelation (Edinburgh 1963), contends — in a rather forced way, it would seem — that John hopes for the conversion of the Gentiles: see the long chapter "The Conversion of the Nations", *ibid.*, 238-337.

extent, all the more so since the very announcement of a near future by itself heightens its impact on the present. But above all there is the Christ-event; Christ has become 'the firstborn of the dead, and the ruler of the kings of the earth' (1,6; cf. the Lamb in 5,6-14). Salvation is an already present reality in history, on earth. The servants of God in Asia experience not only the 'not yet' but without a doubt also this 'already' (⁵⁴).

Modern Christians no longer look forward to the imminent return of their Lord; most of them cannot be convinced that the end is unmistakably near. But they can and should look forward to their personal encounter with the Lord at the moment of their own death. Perhaps, in a sense different from that in Revelation, this encounter may be called a 'first resurrection'. Like the souls of those 'who have been slaughtered for the word of God and for the testimony they have given' we, too, hope to find ourselves 'under the altar' in heaven (cf. 6,9), at death to enter immediately and safely 'the city by the gates' (22,14) and become inhabitants of the new Jerusalem. All this does not, of course, exclude the parousia of the Lord and the final judgment — whatever it means — and the gathering in of all the saints, the end of the age and the consummate fulfillment of history.

No annihilation perhaps but a transformation of the cosmos, not only God's intervention but also human responsible activity, and most probably not a near end but a still open future for human beings whose life span in world history is but a brief breathing space: the conclusion to each of these reflections refers to the need of daily care for this earth and its inhabitants, as well as to the testimony to Jesus and the proclamation of the word of God (cf. 20,4).

Pontificio Istituto Biblico
Via della Pilotta, 25
I-00187 Roma

Jan LAMBRECHT, S.J.

(⁵⁴) Cf. VÖGTLE, *Das Buch mit den sieben Siegeln*, 169: 'Schon in ihren irdischen Existenz verstand sich ja die Urkirche ihrem Wesen nach als eine vorwegnehmende Realisierung des "oberen", des "himmlischen" Jerusalem (Gal 4,25f; Hebr 12,22f)'.

SUMMARY

Rev 20,11-15 and 21,1-8 contain the last two vision reports. The first does not deal with a general resurrection followed by a general judgment with respectively reward and condemnation. Attention is negatively focused on the final judgments of Death and Hades, as well as of those whose names are not found written in the book of life. In the second vision John sees a new heaven and a new earth and, more specifically, the new Jerusalem, i.e., the church universal of the end-time. The voice from the throne and God himself climactically proclaim final blessings. The covenant formula announces God's dwelling among the peoples, the adoption formula even a divine filial relationship: these are the main content of the ultimate blessings. Hermeneutical reflection on annihilation or transformation, on theocentrism versus human responsibility and on the expectation of Christ's imminent parousia conclude the study.

ANIMADVERSIONES

Terminologische Verknüpfungen und Genesis 12,1-3

Zwar bewertet die Pentateuch-Forschung Gen 12,1-3 zumeist als sekundäre Einfügung⁽¹⁾, hebt aber gleichzeitig die theologische Bedeutung dieser "Schlüsselstelle für das Verständnis des kanonischen Textes der Genesis"⁽²⁾ immer wieder hervor. Angesichts der theologischen Gewichtung scheint m.E. die Frage, ob und inwieweit Gen 12,1-3 mit der vorangehenden Urgeschichte verbunden ist, als äußerst angebracht. Trotz der von vielen Forschern vertretenen Hypothese, Gen 12,1-3 stehe keinesfalls in Beziehung zur Urgeschichte, soll hier auf der Grundlage der Text-Endgestalt die enge sprachliche Verknüpfung mit der vorangehenden Urgeschichte aufgezeigt werden. Jede Leserin und jeder Leser des uns überkommenen Textes wird wahrscheinlich der Hypothese zustimmen, die Komposition der Text-Endgestalt sei ihrem "Autor" zumindest ein wenig sinnvoll erschienen, wobei der Begriff "Autor" folgendermaßen verstanden wird: Autor(en) der Endgestalt ist/sind jene Person(en), die jene literarische Einheit komponiert hat/haben, die wir als "Urgeschichte", "Vätergeschichte" oder "Genesis" bezeichnen, literarische Größen die in *dieser* Weise vorher *nicht* bestanden hat, welche mündliche bzw. verschriftlichte Vorgeschichte ihre einzelnen Teile auch gehabt haben mögen.

Der folgende methodologische Ansatz liegt dieser Arbeit, die auf die Offenlegung sogenannter "terminologischer Verknüpfungen"⁽³⁾ abzielt, zugrunde: Die in Gen 12,1-3 gebrauchten Wörter werden auch im Hinblick auf ihr Vorkommen in Gen 1–11 tabellarisch erfaßt. Mittels dieser Auflistung läßt sich ihre relative Häufigkeit und strukturelle Position erkennen, wobei bedeutsamerweise die siebte (zeitweise auch zwölfte) Belegstelle eine struktural signifikante und theologisch tiefgründige Aussage enthält. Die

(1) Zum Beispiel J.L. SKA, "L'appel d'Abraham et l'acte de naissance d'Israel. Genèse 12,1-4a", *Deuteronomy and Deuteronomical Literature*. Festschrift für C.H.W. Brekelmans (Hrsg. M. VERVENNE – J. LUST) (BETHL 133; Löwen 1994) 374; N.C. BAUMGART, "Das Ende der biblischen Urgeschichte", *BN* 82 (1996) 55; E. BLUM, *Die Komposition der Vätergeschichte* (WMANT 57; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1984) 339; F. CRÜSEMANN, "Die Eigenständigkeit der Urgeschichte. Ein Beitrag zur Diskussion um den Jahwisten", *Die Botschaft und die Boten*. Festschrift für Hans Walter Wolff zum 70. Geburtstag (Hrsg. J. JEREMIAS – L. PERLITT) (Neukirchen-Vluyn 1981) 22; vgl. K. BERGE, *Die Zeit des Jahwisten*. Ein Beitrag zur Datierung jahwistischer Vätertexte (BZAW 186; Berlin 1990).

(2) F. CRÜSEMANN, "Menschheit und Volk, Israels Selbstverständnis im genealogischen System der Genesis", *EvT* 58 (1998) 194.

(3) W. WARNING, *Literary Artistry in Leviticus* (BInS 35; Leiden 1999) 25; ders., "Terminologische Verknüpfungen in der Urgeschichte", *ZAW* (im Erscheinen begriffen); ders., "Terminological Patterns and Genesis 38", *AUSS* (im Erscheinen begriffen); vgl. M. TSEVAT, "Abzählungen in 1 Samuel 1–4", *Die Hebräische Bibel und ihre zweifache Nachgeschichte*. Festschrift für Rolf Rendtorff zum 65. Geburtstag (Hrsg. E. BLUM) (Neukirchen Vluyn 1990) 207–214.

Plausibilität dieser auf "numerologischen" Gesichtspunkten basierenden Kompositionstechnik hat sich bereits an anderen ausgewählten Pentateuchabschnitten aufzeigen lassen⁽⁴⁾.

An dieser Stelle sei es gestattet, die Resultate der vorliegenden Arbeit vorwegnehmend darzulegen: In Gen 12,1-3 erscheinen der Eigenname אַבְרָם "Abram", die Nomina גֵּי "Volk" und מִשְׁפָּחָה "Sippe", das Verb בָּרַךְ "segnen" sowie das Adjektiv גָּדוֹל "groß" jeweils zum *siebten* und das Verb הָלַךְ "gehen" zum *zwölften* Mal in der Genesis⁽⁵⁾.

Der Eigenname "Abram": Er begegnet uns zum ersten Mal in der Geburtsnotiz in Gen 11,26, "Terach war siebzig Jahre alt und zeugte Abram, Nahor und Haran". Diese außerdem in 11,27.29 (2x).31 (2x) vorliegende Namensform erscheint in 12,1 somit zum *siebten* Mal in der Genesis. Während der siebte Beleg in den Kontext der ersten an Abram gerichteten Gottesrede eingebunden ist, folgt der *zwölften* Erwähnung (vgl. 12,4[2x].5.6) in 12,7aα unmittelbar "the first recorded appearance of the Lord to a patriarch"⁽⁶⁾: "JHWH erschien Abram und sprach: deinen Nachkommen will ich dieses Land geben" (12,7aβ). Einzige Inhalte dieser Verheißung sind Nachkommenschaft und Besitz des Landes.

Mittels der in der Text-Endgestalt vorliegenden terminologischen Verknüpfung ist dem Autor offenbar ein Zweifaches gelungen: Zum einen ist ihm die terminologische Verknüpfung von Gen 12,1-3 mit der genealogischen Tafel in Gen 11 gut geglückt, und zum anderen zeigt sich sein literarisches Können darin, dass er durch diese numerologisch konzipierte Struktur die "Vollkommenheit" der ersten Wortoffenbarung und der ersten Gotteserscheinung gekonnt zum Ausdruck gebracht hat.

Das Verb "gehen": Den ersten zwölf Belegen (2,14; 3,8.14; 5,22.24; 6,9; 7,18; 8,3.5; 9,23; 11,31; 12,1) des Allerweltwortes scheint ebenfalls eine strukturierende Funktion zu eignen⁽⁷⁾. Während in der siebten Belegstelle das Verb gewissermaßen die "Seetüchtigkeit" der Arche konstatiert, "und die Arche fuhr (וָהָלַךְ) auf den Wassern" (7,18), bildet der *zwölfte* Beleg das erste Wort, das JHWH an Abram, den Ahnherrn der zwölf Stämme Israels, richtet. Diese mit "gehe aus deinem Land und deinem Vaterhaus" "unvermittelt einsetzende Jahwerede"⁽⁸⁾ erscheint nur auf den ersten Blick unvermittelt, denn der "Gott J-h-w-h war für Abraham kein Unbekannter, sondern ein Erbe von früheren Geschlechtern von Sem, Noah bis auf Adam zurück, und insofern konnte unmittelbar an das Vorhergehende angeschlossen werden"⁽⁹⁾.

⁽⁴⁾ In augenfälliger Weise stellt WARNING, *Literary Artistry*, 52-54; 77-81; 133-135; 152-159 die Ergebnisse tabellarisch dar.

⁽⁵⁾ Insgesamt untermauert dieses Ergebnis die u.a. von J. BARR, "Semantics and Biblical Theology — A Contribution to the Discussion", *Congress Volume*. Uppsala 1971 (VTS 22; Leiden 1972) 11-19 vertretene Auffassung, dass diese struktural signifikanten Wörter ihre Bedeutung und Bedeutsamkeit aufgrund des konkreten Kontexts gewinnen.

⁽⁶⁾ G.J. WENHAM, *Genesis 1-15* (WBC 1; Waco 1987) 279.

⁽⁷⁾ Der samaritanische Pentateuch fügt in Gen 4,8 "laß uns aufs Feld gehen" ein. U. CASSUTO, *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis* (Jerusalem 1961) I, 213-215, diskutiert die unterschiedlichen Lesarten und schlußfolgert: "The divergences between these recensions and translations prove that we have here not a common original reading, but a common exposition" (214).

⁽⁸⁾ C. LEVIN, *Der Jahwist* (FRLANT 157; Göttingen 1993) 133.

⁽⁹⁾ B. JAKOB, *Das erste Buch der Tora*. Genesis (Berlin 1936) 333.

Die beiden bisher vorgelegten terminologischen Verknüpfungen erwecken den Eindruck, als habe der antike Autor strukturelle "Form" benutzt, um verhalten, aber dem aufmerksamen Leser dennoch deutlich vernehmbar, theologischen "Gehalt" zu vermitteln. Eine theologisch aussagekräftige Botschaft wird auch durch die Streuung des Nomens "Volk" vermittelt, der wir uns nun zuwenden.

Das Nomen "Volk": Den ersten sechs Belegstellen in Gen 10,5 (2x).20.31.32 (2x) folgt die siebte ebenfalls in den Eingangsworten der Vätergeschichte (12,2). Hierbei läßt sich die augenfällige Anknüpfung von Gen 12,2 an die vorhergehende Völkertafel auch aufgrund der wohl mit Bedacht gestalteten sechs Belege in Gen 10 unschwer ausmachen. Die Wendung "und von diesen zweigten sich die Völker ab" (VV. 5.32) bildet eine fast das gesamte 10. Kapitel umfassende Inklusio, wobei die zweimal gebrauchte Nominalform "die Völker" (VV. 5a.32b) offensichtlich als strukturierender Rahmen für die vier suffigierten Formen (VV. 5b.20.31.32a) dient. In 10,5 findet sich eine abschließende Bemerkung für die Nachkommen Japheths, V. 20 rundet die Völkertafel der Hamiten ab, in V. 31 wird die Nachkommenschaft Sems abgeschlossen, und zusammenfassend erwähnt V. 32, "dies sind die Sippen der Söhne Noahs gemäß ihren Geschlechtern nach ihren Völkern, und von ihnen zweigten sich die Völker der Erde nach der Sintflut ab". Sollte sich die These, dass Gen 12,2 "das Wort *gōj* absichtlich gebraucht" ⁽¹⁰⁾, als richtig erweisen, wird man der Hypothese, der siebte Beleg des Nomen sei ein gelungenes Verbindungsglied zwischen der Völkertafel und Vätergeschichte, kaum ein Argument entgegensetzen können.

Wenn in Gen 10,5.20.31.32 der Eindruck vermittelt wird, dass "die Völker aus Geschlechtern mit je einem Stammvater bestehen" ⁽¹¹⁾, sollten wir uns bewußt machen, dass JHWH in seiner ersten Begegnung mit dem noch kinderlosen Erzvater von dessen Nachkommen als einem "großen Volk" spricht. Möglicherweise soll die Vertrauenswürdigkeit der göttlichen Verheißung mittels der durch die Zahl "Sieben" vermittelten Vollkommenheit hervorgehoben werden. Aber nicht nur das Nomen "Volk" liegt an dieser Stelle zum siebten Mal vor, sondern gleichfalls das dieses Substantiv qualifizierende Adjektiv "groß".

Das Adjektiv "groß": Der *siebte* Beleg des Adjektivs ⁽¹²⁾ zielt gleichermaßen auf die gewichtigen Einleitungsworte der Vätergeschichte ab. In jeder der vorhergehenden Strukturen scheinen kompositorische Kunstfertigkeit und theologische Aussage einander zu ergänzen, und das ist auch hier der Fall. Nach den ersten sechs Belegstellen (1,16(2x).21; 4,13; 10,12.21), die augenscheinlich auf 12,2 abheben, "ich werde dich zu einem großen Volk machen", wird das der Zahl "Sieben" innewohnende Moment der Vollkommenheit ein weiteres Mal vom Autor benutzt, um mittels struktureller Form theologischen Gehalt deutlich hervorzuheben.

Die dreimal in der Abrahamgeschichte gebrauchte Wendung "großes

⁽¹⁰⁾ J.A. SOGGIN, *Das Buch Genesis*. Kommentar (Darmstadt 1997) 202.

⁽¹¹⁾ BERGE, *Die Zeit des Jahwisten*, 60.

⁽¹²⁾ Zu dem im samaritanischen Pentateuch in 10,19 noch einmal vorliegenden "groß", übrigens eine mit Gen 15,18bβ identische Lesart, meint WENHAM, *Genesis*, 212, der Samaritanus "substitutes a simpler summary of the boundaries of Canaan".

Volk" zielt in 12,2 und 18,18 direkt auf Abraham ab, d.h. ohne namentliche Nennung eines Nachkommen, während in 17,20 (nach 12,17; 15,12.14.18 die *zwölfte* Belegstelle) erwähnt wird, "auch wegen Ismael erhöere ich dich ... und ich werde ihn zu einem großen Volk machen". Wenn nirgendwo so über Isaak, den Verheißungsträger, gesprochen wird, können wir schlußfolgern, dass die Ismael geltenden göttlichen Verheißungen auch struktural in die Text-Endgestalt eingebunden sind. Da "Volk" und "groß" hier kaum zufälligerweise zum je siebten Mal vorliegen, überrascht es kaum mehr, dass das unmittelbar Verb "segnen" an dieser Stelle ebenfalls zum siebten Mal vorkommt.

Das Verb "segnen": Durch die auf diesem Verb beruhende terminologische Verknüpfung werden Gen 1,22.28; 2,3; 5,2; 9,1.26 mit jener Aussage (12,2), wo zum ersten Mal von Abram als dem Empfänger des göttlichen Segens gesprochen wird, untrennbar verknüpft. Angesichts der unleugbaren Tatsache, dass in der in Gen 12,2 vorliegenden Wendung, "ich will dich zu einem großen Volk machen und dich segnen", die drei unmittelbar aufeinander folgenden Wörter "Volk", "groß" und "segnen", jeweils zum siebten Mal in der Genesis vorliegen, bleibt uns m.E. nur eine sinnvolle Schlußfolgerung: Welche mündlichen oder verschriftlichten Vorlagen der Urgeschichte und Abrahamerzählung dem Autor der Text-Endgestalt vorgelegen haben mögen, er legt zweifelsohne sein kompositorisches Können und seine theologische Tiefgründigkeit an den Tag.

Das Nomen "Sippe; Arten": Auch die Streuung der zwölf Belege dieses Begriffs besticht wieder aufgrund der siebten Belegstelle. Während das Nomen in Gen 8,19 in seiner semantischen Bedeutung "Arten" benutzt wird, verwendet der Autor der Text-Endgestalt es in allen folgenden Texten (10,5.18.20.31.32; 12,3; 24,38.40.41; 28,14; 36,40) im Sinne von "Sippe". Um in Gen 12,2-3 den Bedeutungsunterschied der Nomen "Sippe" und "Volk" besser zu begreifen, bietet es sich an, Gen 10 in die Überlegungen einzubeziehen, denn bei genauerer Betrachtung von Gen 10 gewinnt man den Eindruck, dass die dort aufgelisteten Völker je aus einzelnen "Sippen" bestehen. Diese bilden demzufolge die soziologischen Untereinheiten, aus denen sich jedes Volk, die größere soziologische Gruppe, zusammensetzt. Wenn wir Gen 12,3b also bewußt in Beziehung zu den vorangehenden Belegstellen setzen, gewinnt die Aussage "und in dir werden gesegnet werden alle Geschlechter des Erde" sehr wohl an Gewicht.

Die strukturelle Signifikanz des Nomens in Gen 12,3b/28,14b wird aufgrund der wort-identischen Wendung "und in dir werden gesegnet werden alle Geschlechter der Erde" noch augenfälliger. Wenn der "kompositorische Rahmen" dieser wortidentischen Aussage die Brautwerbungserzählung in Gen 24 gekonnt umschließt, so reicht die auf dem Nomen "Sippe" basierende terminologische Verknüpfung insgesamt von der Berufung Abrams bis hinein in die Jakobgeschichte, ja sogar die Liste der Nachkommenschaft Esaus in Gen 36 ist mit eingebunden.

*
* *

Entgegen der in der Pentateuchforschung weitverbreiteten Auffassung, zwischen Gen 12,1-3 und der Urgeschichte sei "kaum ein Zusammenhang

angedeutet oder ersichtlich" (¹³), scheint die anfangs aufgestellte Hypothese, dass zeitweise die siebte bzw. zwölfte Belegstelle eines Begriffes eine struktural signifikante und theologisch tiefgründige Aussage bringe, sich als textgemäß erwiesen zu haben. Mehrere strukturelle Linien der Urgeschichte scheinen in Gen 12,1-3, gewissermaßen ihrem Zielpunkt, zusammenzutreffen, und somit sind die berühmten Eröffnungsworte der Vätergeschichte in der Tat eine "Schlüsselstelle für das Verständnis des kanonischen Textes der Genesis" (¹⁴).

Rhönstrasse 4
D-64560 Riedstadt
Germany

Wilfried WARNING

SUMMARY

Technical word combinations based on the terms 'Abram', 'nation', 'clan', 'to bless', 'large' and 'to walk' allow one to recognize a close linguistic relationship between the primeval history and the introductory words of the story of the patriarchal narrative.

(¹³) BAUMGART, "Das Ende der biblischen Urgeschichte", 53.

(¹⁴) CRÜSEMANN, "Menschheit und Volk", 194.

The Dimensions and Capacity of the 'Molten Sea' in 1 Kgs 7,23.26

A seemingly intractable problem associated with the description of King Solomon's 'molten sea' in 1 Kgs 7,23.26 is the apparent discrepancy between its given dimensions and its given capacity. The given dimensions are a diameter of 10 cubits, a height of 5 cubits, and a circumference of 30 cubits. Assuming that these are the interior dimensions of a cylindrical vessel and that the given diameter and circumference reflect the Babylonian *pi* value of 3, the volume of the sea can be calculated as 375 cubic cubits ⁽¹⁾. The given capacity is 2,000 baths, indicating $5\frac{1}{3}$ baths per cubic cubit. Because, however, the most commonly cited approximations of the Hebrew cubit and the *bath* are 444 mm and 22 l, there should be only 4 baths per cubic cubit, each *bath* comprising a square prism 1 cubit on a side and $\frac{1}{4}$ cubit thick ⁽²⁾. This would indicate that the capacity of the sea should have been 1,500 baths instead of 2,000 baths ⁽³⁾.

The discrepancy can be resolved if the particular *bath* associated with the sea is taken not as $\frac{1}{4}$ of a cubic cubit, but rather as $\frac{1}{4}$ of a cylinder with a height and diameter of 1 cubit. Instead of being a square prism 1 cubit on a side and $\frac{1}{4}$ cubit thick, this *bath* would be a cylinder 1 cubit in diameter and $\frac{3}{4}$ cubit thick. In Babylonian metrology, with its *pi* value of 3, a circle inscribed in a square would have $\frac{3}{4}$ the area of the square, and a cylinder inscribed in a square prism would have $\frac{3}{4}$ the volume of the prism. Thus a cylinder having a height and diameter of 1 cubit would have $\frac{3}{4}$ the volume of a cubic cubit, and the cylindrical *bath* proposed above would have $\frac{3}{4}$ the volume of the square prismatic *bath*. Conversely, the cubes and square prisms would therefore have $1\frac{1}{3}$ the volume of their corresponding cylindrical measures. In Babylonian reckoning, then, there would have indeed been $1\frac{1}{3} \times 4 = 5\frac{1}{3}$ of these cylindrical baths per cubic cubit and $375 \times 5\frac{1}{3} = 2,000$ of them in the sea.

Although the assumption of the cylindrical *bath* makes these figures come out exactly right, the question naturally arises as to whether there are any metrological precedents that might substantiate the existence of cylindrical capacity measures having the same nominal value as their larger square

⁽¹⁾ M.A. POWELL, "Weights and Measures", *ABD* VI, 902.

⁽²⁾ See R.B.Y. SCOTT, "The Hebrew Cubit", *JBL* 77 (1958) 205-214, for a detailed explanation of the 444 mm cubit and the 22 l *bath*. Although derived independently from different archaeological data, these approximate values both conduce to 4 baths per cubic cubit, a 444 mm cubit yielding a *bath* of slightly under 22 l, and a *bath* of 22 l yielding a cubit of slightly over 444 mm. Scott himself believed that the sea was a hemisphere with a capacity of approximately 1,000 baths, mistakenly recorded as 2,000 baths by a writer who erroneously calculated the volume of a sphere instead of a hemisphere.

⁽³⁾ Ways of resolving the dimension/capacity discrepancy have included positing a relatively longer cubit, a relatively smaller *bath*, bulges or protrusions in the walls of the sea to give it additional capacity, and computational error. The issue is further complicated by the fact that 2 Chr 4,5 gives the capacity of the sea as 3,000 baths.

prismatic counterparts. Indeed there are. An Old Babylonian capacity measure known as the *sila*, for example, came in several different sizes, each square prismatic format having a correspondingly smaller cylindrical counterpart ⁽⁴⁾. The rationale behind a cylindrical system of measures is probably the ease it affords in performing certain calculations. For example, calculating the volume of a cylindrical structure the usual way in cubic cubits would involve tripling the diameter to obtain the circumference, squaring the circumference and multiplying that result by $1\frac{1}{2}$ to obtain the cross-sectional area, and then multiplying that result by the height ⁽⁵⁾. Calculating the capacity in 'cubit cylinders', however, would simply entail squaring the diameter and multiplying by the height ⁽⁶⁾. Squaring the diameter of the sea and multiplying by the height would give a capacity of $(10 \times 10) \times 5 = 500$ cubit cylinders, each containing 4 cylindrical baths for a total of 2,000 cylindrical baths.

5401 Rampart 414
Houston, TX 77081
USA

George M. HOLLENBACK

SUMMARY

The apparent discrepancy between the given dimensions and capacity of King Solomon's 'molten sea' in 1 Kgs 7,23.26 can be resolved in the light of insights provided by a particular kind of cylindrical capacity measure system attested in Old Babylonian metrology.

⁽⁴⁾ J. FRIBERG, "Seed and Reeds Continued: Another Metro-Mathematical Topic Text from Late Babylonian Uruk", *BaghM* 28 (1997) 311-312. It is interesting to note that the modern day quart, like the *sila*, also comes in different sizes: standard American quart, dry measure quart, and British imperial quart.

⁽⁵⁾ The Babylonians calculated circle area as $A = \frac{1}{12} \times C^2$; see L.N.H. BUNT – P.S. JONES – J.D. BEDIANT, *The Historical Roots of Elementary Mathematics* (Englewood Cliffs 1976; repr.: New York 1988) 61-62.

⁽⁶⁾ E. ZEBROWSKI, *A History of the Circle*. Mathematical Reasoning and the Physical Universe (New Brunswick 1999) 72, cites a curious modern day application of the same principle used to calculate circular cross-sectional areas of electrical wires of different diameters. The *cmil* ('circular mil') is the cross-sectional area of a wire $\frac{1}{1,000}$ of an inch in diameter. The cross-sectional area of any wire can easily be calculated in *cmils* by simply squaring the diameter of the wire as measured in increments of $\frac{1}{1,000}$ of an inch.

New Light on Hezekiah's Second Prophetic Story (2 Kgs 19,9b-35)

The biblical story of Sennacherib's campaign to Judah has been discussed in a great number of books, articles and commentaries. The list of publications is so long that we may well wonder whether it is still possible — on the basis of the extant sources — to significantly advance our understanding of any aspect of the story.

The majority of scholars agree that the text of Isaiah had its original context in Kings⁽¹⁾. B. Stade suggested that the account of Sennacherib's campaign was built of two sources: a chronistic record (18,13-16) and two prophetic stories (18,17-19,9a.37; 19,9b-20.30-37)⁽²⁾. His arguments were accepted by some early scholars (A. Šanda is an exception)⁽³⁾. B.S. Childs revised this suggestion and proposed that the first prophetic story (Account B₁) included 18,17-19,9a.36-37 and the second story (Account B₂) included 19,9b-35⁽⁴⁾. Most scholars adopted this revision, and scholarly disagreements have been confined largely to the problem of the original scope of the two prophetic stories, and in particular to the scope of Account B₂⁽⁵⁾.

It is the purpose of this article to re-examine some elements in Account B₂ which have not been satisfactorily explained by scholars, in an effort to shed more light on the date and place in which it was composed. The results of this re-examination will also be applied to the discussion of Account B₁. I will not discuss the complicated problem of the original scope of the two stories, since it is external to this discussion. I will also try to avoid repetition of what has already been said by other scholars, and concentrate on some new suggestions that I should like to present.

⁽¹⁾ See recently, A.H. KONKEL, "The sources of the Story of Hezekiah in the Book of Isaiah", VT 43 (1993) 462-482; H.G.M. WILLIAMSON, "Hezekiah and the Temple", *Texts, Temples, and Traditions. A Tribute to Menahem Haran* (eds. M.V. Fox et al.) (Winona Lake 1996) 47-52; M.A. SWEENEY, *Isaiah 1-39 with an Introduction to Prophetic Literature* (FOTL 16; Grand Rapids 1996) 477-483; R.E. PERSON, *The Kings-Isaiah and Kings-Jeremiah Recensions* (BZAW 252; Berlin 1997) 5-79.

⁽²⁾ B. STADE, "Miscellen. 16. Anmerkungen zu 2 Kö. 15-21. Zu 18,13-19,37", ZAW 4 (1886) 172-186.

⁽³⁾ For early scholars who discussed Stade's suggestion, see A. ŠANDA, *Die Bücher der Könige übersetzt und erklärt* (EHAT 9; Münster 1912) II, 289-291; F.J. GONÇALVES, *L'expédition de Sennachérib en Palestine dans la littérature Hébraïque ancienne* (Louvain-la-neuve 1986) 351-354.

⁽⁴⁾ B.S. CHILDS, *Isaiah and the Assyrian Crisis* (SBT 3; London 1967) 69-103; see GONÇALVES, *L'expédition de Sennachérib*, 355-363, 376-394, 449-455, with earlier literature.

⁽⁵⁾ See the list of authors cited by B.O. LONG, *2 Kings* (FOTL 10; Grand Rapids 1991) 200; PERSON, *Recensions*, 76, n. 8. For recent detailed discussion of Account B₂, see GONÇALVES, *L'expédition de Sennachérib*, 449-477, with earlier literature.

The List of Conquered Places in 2 Kings 19,12-13

The key for dating Account B₂ (2 Kgs 19,9b-35) is the list of cities mentioned in vv. 12-13. The text runs as follows:

Did the gods of the nations save them whom my ancestors destroyed,
Gozan, Haran, Rezeph, and the people of Eden who were in Telassar?
Where is the king of Hamath and the king of Arpad and the king of
Lair, Sepharvaim, Hena, and Ivvah?

This text may be compared with 2 Kgs 18,33-34, which is part of the second speech of the Rabshakeh in Account B₁:

Did any of the gods of the nations ever save his land from the king of Assyria? Where are the gods of Hamath and Arpad? Where are the gods of Sepharvaim? []⁽⁶⁾. [Where are the gods of Samaria?]⁽⁷⁾. Did they save Samaria from me?

Hamath, Arpad and Samaria participated in the anti-Assyrian rebellion that broke out in Syria-Palestine upon the death of Shalmaneser V, when Sargon II ascended the throne in 722 BCE⁽⁸⁾. After he crushed the rebellion in 720 BCE, Sargon annexed Hamath and Samaria to the Assyrian territory. Arpad was an Assyrian province since 738 BCE and after the rebellion was probably re-organized⁽⁹⁾. Sepharvaim appears in 2 Kings 17,24 as the origin of settlers whom Sargon deported to the province of Samerina in his late years⁽¹⁰⁾, and is

⁽⁶⁾ Hena and Ivvah are missing from Isaiah 36,19 and the LXX of 2 Kgs 18,34, and many scholars suggested that they entered the text from 19,13. See H.M. ORLINSKY, "The Kings-Isaiah Recensions of the Hezekiah Story", *JQR* 30 (1939) 45; PERSON, *Recensions*, 18, 62, with earlier literature in n. 53. For a different opinion, see D. BARTHÉLEMY, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament* (OBO 50/1; Fribourg 1982) I, 411.

⁽⁷⁾ The end of the verse requires a preceding question, like the one found in the Lucianic and Vulgate versions. For the restoration, see C.F. BURNEY, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings with an Introduction and Appendix* (Oxford 1903; repr. New York 1970) 342; ŠANDA, *Die Bücher der Könige*, 260; ORLINSKY, "Kings-Isaiah Recensions", 46; M. ANBAR, "Καὶ ποῦ εἰσὶν οἱ θεοὶ τῆς χώρας Σαμαρείας et où sont les dieux du pays de Samarie?", *BN* 51 (1990) 7-8. For a different opinion, see J.A. MONTGOMERY, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Kings* (ICC; Edinburgh 1951) 503; BARTHÉLEMY, *Critique textuelle* I, 411; PERSON, *Recensions*, 63 (note 69).

⁽⁸⁾ H. TADMOR, "The Campaigns of Sargon II of Assur: A Chronological-Historical Study", *JCS* 12 (1958) 33-39; H.W.F. SAGGS, "Historical Texts and Fragments of Sargon II of Assyria", *Iraq* 37 (1975) 14, line 20; A. FUCHS, *Die Inschriften Sargons II. aus Khorsabad* (Göttingen 1994) 89, line 25; 200-201, line 33.

⁽⁹⁾ It should be noted that among the six places mentioned in Isa 10,9, four participated in the anti-Assyrian alliance that fought Sargon in 720 BCE (Hamath, Arpad, Damascus and Samaria). Carchemish was annexed by Sargon three years later, in 717 BCE. Only Calno/Calneh (Assyrian Kullani), the capital of the former kingdom of Unqi/Patina that was annexed by Tiglath-pileser III in 738 BCE, is not mentioned in Sargon's inscriptions. However, Sargon's annals for the year 720 are broken and details of the anti-Assyrian rebellion in the west in this year are incomplete. Thus it is possible that Kullani/Calneh participated in the anti-Assyrian coalition that fought Sargon in 720 BCE, but is missing from the extant corpus of Sargon's inscriptions. Isaiah could have deliberately selected six central cities conquered and annexed (or re-annexed) by Sargon II in his early years, since his audience/readers had heard of the conquest of the cities not long before the prophecy was said/written.

⁽¹⁰⁾ For the date of the Assyrian deportation to the province of Samerina, see N. NA'AMAN and R. ZADOK, "Assyrian Deportations to the Province of Samerina in the Light of Two Cuneiform Tablets from Tel Hadid", *Tel Aviv* 27 (forthcoming).

identified in the area of eastern Babylonia⁽¹¹⁾. It is mentioned before Samaria, the region where the deportees were settled. The text of 2 Kgs 18,33-34 refers to three cities that participated in the rebellion against Sargon in 720 BCE, and to a place in eastern Babylonia that was conquered by Sargon during his campaigns against Babylonia in the years 710-709 BCE⁽¹²⁾. It is evident that the four toponyms mentioned in Account B₁ are drawn from the western and eastern campaigns of Sargon II, Sennacherib's father.

The list of cities in 2 Kgs 19,12-13 is almost entirely different from the list in 2 Kgs 18,33-34, and from the list of peoples settled by Sargon II in Samaria according to 2 Kgs 17,24. Most scholars agree on the identification of the places mentioned in vv. 12-13⁽¹³⁾. Some of these places (Gozan, Harran, Rezepth-Rašappa and Eden-Bīt Adini) are located in northern Mesopotamia, and were conquered and annexed by Assyria in the time of Ashurnasirpal II (883-859) and the early years of Shalmaneser III (858-824). Why did the author of Account B₂ select places which were conquered and annexed hundreds of years before his time to exemplify the Assyrian conquests? Another group of places (Telassar, Lair, Sepharvaim, Hena and Ivvah) is probably located in eastern Babylonia. Again, why did the author include these remote and unimportant eastern places in his list of conquered towns? Hamath and Arpad are located in Syria, and their location and history differ from the other places in this list. The selection of these places requires an explanation, and we shall first examine some suggestions offered by scholars for this enigmatic list.

H. Wildberger doubted whether the narrator had any clear idea about the time and circumstances in which these places fell to the hands of Assyria and suggested that the author simply expanded the list of Isa 36,19⁽¹⁴⁾. F.J. Gonçalves suggested that some cities are connected with the deportation to Samaria (Hamath, Sepharvaim, Ivvah), whereas Gozan is one of the places to which inhabitants of the Northern Kingdom were deported⁽¹⁵⁾. E. Ben Zvi assumed that v. 12 refers to places where deportees from the Northern Kingdom were settled, and v. 13 refers to places from which came the deportees who were settled in Samaria⁽¹⁶⁾. However, only one name (Gozan) is common to v. 12 and the list of Israelite deportees settled in Assyria (2 Kgs 17,6), and only two names (Sepharvaim and Ivvah/Avva) appear in v. 13 and the list of deportees to Samaria (2 Kgs 17,24)⁽¹⁷⁾. The assumption that the author of Account B₂ was better acquainted with the Assyrian deportations of

⁽¹¹⁾ For the identification of places mentioned in 2 Kgs 17,24, see R. ZADOK, "Geographical and Onomastic Notes", *JANES* 8 (1976) 115-116.

⁽¹²⁾ For the Babylonian campaigns of Sargon II, see J.A. BRINKMAN, "Merodach-Baladan II", *Studies Presented to A. Leo Oppenheim* (eds. R.D. BIGGS - J.A. BRINKMAN) (Chicago 1964) 12-27; FUCHS, *Die Inschriften Sargons*, 309-405.

⁽¹³⁾ For the identification of the list of towns, see SANDA, *Die Bücher der Könige*, 260, 272-273; G.R. DRIVER, "Geographical Problems", *Eretz Israel* 5 (1958) 16*-20*; ZADOK, "Notes", 113-124; GONÇALVES, *L'expédition de Sennachérib*, 458-461.

⁽¹⁴⁾ H. WILDBERGER, *Jesaja* (BKAT X/3; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1982) III, 1424.

⁽¹⁵⁾ GONÇALVES, *L'expédition de Sennachérib*, 462.

⁽¹⁶⁾ E. BEN ZVI, "Who Wrote the Speech of the Rabshakeh and when?", *JBL* 109 (1990) 89-91.

⁽¹⁷⁾ The city of Hamath mentioned in 2 Kgs 17,24, is located in eastern Babylonia (ZADOK, "Notes", 117-120), whereas the Hamath of 2 Kgs 19,13 is located in central Syria.

the time of Sargon II than the Deuteronomist (the author of 2 Kgs 17,6.24) is unconvincing. Moreover, the text of vv. 12-13 refers to conquests rather than deportations, although deportees could have arrived from/at these places.

S.W. Holloway suggested that Harran must be treated separately from all the other places mentioned in vv. 12-13⁽¹⁸⁾. He discussed at length the history and cult of Harran in the Neo-Assyrian period, and concluded that it is unlikely that an Assyrian referred to the cult centre of Harran as a city destroyed by his forefathers. Harran was conquered by the Babylonians in 610-609 BCE, and this is the background for its inclusion in the list of conquered places⁽¹⁹⁾. Adopting Hardmeier's suggestion that the description of Sennacherib's blockade of Jerusalem was patterned on the Babylonian siege of Jerusalem in 588 BCE⁽²⁰⁾, Holloway suggested that the inclusion of Harran's name in Rabshakeh's speech should be interpreted in the context of the 588 BCE war against the Babylonians.

As for the other places, Holloway adopted the widely held view that Sennacherib boasted of the victories of his forefathers over them. He offered no explanation for excluding Harran from the list of places. Nevertheless, I believe that he was on the right track in suggesting that the conquest of Harran reflects the Babylonian campaigns of the years 610-609 BCE. It seems to me that the list of cities in vv. 12-13 reflects the conquests of Nabopolassar and Nebuchadrezzar in the late seventh century BCE, and that some of these conquests are mentioned in the Babylonian chronicles, the only source that we have for the emergence of the Babylonian Empire.

Following is a discussion of the list of towns in light of this suggestion.

(a) Harran held an important place in the late Assyrian empire. Sargon, Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal built the city and its temple, and Ashurbanipal (668-631) nominated his younger brother as high priest (*šešgallu*) in the temple of Sin of Harran⁽²¹⁾. Ashur-uballit, the last king of Assyria, ascended the throne in Harran in 611 BCE⁽²²⁾. In the following year (610), the Babylonian army under Nabopolassar and the Median troops besieged Harran and captured it, and 'carried off the vast booty of the city and the temple'. In the next year (609), the Babylonian garrison stationed in Harran was attacked by Assyrian-Egyptian troops, but fought back until the withdrawal of the attacking force⁽²³⁾.

⁽¹⁸⁾ S.W. HOLLOWAY, "Harran: Cultic Geography in the Neo-Assyrian Empire and its Implications for Sennacherib's 'Letter to Hezekiah' in 2 Kings", *The Pitcher is Broken. Memorial Essays for Gösta W. Ahlström* (eds. S.W. HOLLOWAY – L.K. HANDY; JSOTSS 190; Sheffield 1995) 311-312.

⁽¹⁹⁾ HOLLOWAY, "Harran", 276-314 (especially 312-314).

⁽²⁰⁾ HARDMEIER, *Prophetie im Streit vor dem Untergang Judas. Erzählkommunikative Studien zur Entstehungssituation der Jesaja- und Jeremiaerzählungen in II Reg 18-20 und Jer 37-40* (BEvT 79; München 1978) 392-408.

⁽²¹⁾ M. STRECK, *Assurbanipal und die letzten assyrischen Könige bis zum Untergange Niniveh's II* (Leipzig 1916) 250, lines 17-18.

⁽²²⁾ A.K. GRAYSON, *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles* (TCS 5; Locust Valley 1975) 94-95, lines 49-50.

⁽²³⁾ GRAYSON, *Chronicles*, 95-96, lines 58-70; S. ZAWADZKI, *The Fall of Assyria and the Median-Babylonian Relations in Light of the Nabopolassar Chronicle* (Poznan 1988) 121-126.

According to the inscriptions of Nabonidus (556-539), the city of Harran suffered heavy damage and declined for many years, until he restored it to its former glory. The temple of Sin was plundered during the Babylonian conquest and the city was partly destroyed because of its prominent place in the late Assyrian Empire. The words 'did the gods of the nations save them whom my ancestors destroyed' in 2 Kgs 19,12 may allude to the destruction of Harran and the despoliation of its temples by the Babylonians⁽²⁴⁾.

(b) After the conquest of Nineveh in 612 BCE, the Babylonian troops advanced westward, conquered Našibin and brought a heavy booty and exiles '[from the lands of GN] and Rušapu' ⁽²⁵⁾. Rušapu-Rašappa is located in the Sindjar plain of Upper Mesopotamia and was the capital of an Assyrian province⁽²⁶⁾. Its identification with biblical Rezep (rešep) is self-evident.

(c) In the following year (611) Nabopolassar marched against the city of Ruggulitu, captured it and killed its inhabitants⁽²⁷⁾. Ruggulitu is mentioned in the annals of Shalmaneser III as an important city of the kingdom of Bīt Adini, which he captured and annexed to Assyria (856 BCE)⁽²⁸⁾. In 611 BCE, about 250 years later, it was conquered and annexed by the Babylonians.

In the following years Nabopolassar conquered all the Assyrian territories up to the Euphrates, so that in 607 he was able to cross the Euphrates and conquer the city of Kimuḫu (modern Samsat)⁽²⁹⁾.

We may conclude that Nabopolassar conquered the cities of Gozan, Harran, Rašappa and the land of Bīt Adini in the course of his conquest of Upper Mesopotamian in the years 612-610 BCE. Captives were taken from the conquered areas and settled in Babylonia. Among them were probably the Edenites, whom the Babylonians settled at Telassar-Til Aššuri.

(d) Til Aššuri is located on the Diyala River, near the border between Babylonia and Media⁽³⁰⁾. Shilḫazi, a place near Til Aššuri, is called by Tiglath-pileser III 'fortress of the Babylonians', and was probably a Babylonian fort on the border with Media. Babylonians apparently lived in Til Aššuri in the time of Tiglath-pileser III and worshiped Marduk, their national god, in the local temple. When the Babylonians regained their territories, they established their border with Media along the same line. Deportees from Bīt Adini were probably brought to this place, which must have been the central

⁽²⁴⁾ D. BALTZER, "Harran nach 610 'medisch'? Kritische Überprüfung einer Hypothese", *WO* 7 (1973) 68-95; A. BEAULIEU, *The Reign of Nabonidus, King of Babylonia, 556-539 B.C.* (YNER 10; New Haven - London 1989) 58-61, 104-115; T.G. LEE, "The Jasper Cylinder Seal of Aššurbanipal and Nabonidus' Making of Sîn's Statue", *RA* 87 (1993) 131-136; W. MEIER, "Nabonidus Herkunft", *Dubsar anta-men. Studien zur Altorientalistik. Festschrift für Willem H.Ph. Römer* (eds. M. DIETRICH - O. LORETZ) (Münster 1998) 245-261.

⁽²⁵⁾ GRAYSON, *Chronicles*, 94, lines 47-49.

⁽²⁶⁾ E. FÖRRER, *Die Provinzeinteilung des assyrischen Reiches* (Leipzig 1920) 12; S. DALLEY, "A Stela of Adad-nirari III and Nergal-ereš from Tell al Rimah", *Iraq* 30 (1968) 150-151; M. COGAN - H. TADMOR, *II Kings. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB; Garden City 1988) 235.

⁽²⁷⁾ GRAYSON, *Chronicles*, 95, lines 56-57.

⁽²⁸⁾ FÖRRER, *Die Provinzeinteilung*, 25.

⁽²⁹⁾ GRAYSON, *Chronicles*, 97-98, lines 12-15.

⁽³⁰⁾ ZADOK, "Notes", 123-124; H. TADMOR, *The Inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser III King of Assyria* (Jerusalem 1994) 72-73.

Babylonian city in this area, and these deportees are mentioned by the author of Account B₂.

(e) The district (*pīḥatu*) of Hamath was conquered by Nebuchadrezzar after he defeated the Egyptian troops in Carchemish (605 BCE)⁽³¹⁾. Arpad was captured in the course of this campaign. The combination of Hamath and Arpad is influenced by the references to the cities in Account B₁ (2 Kgs 18,34) and Isa 10,9. However, for the readers of B₂, the reference to the gods of Hamath points to its recent capture by Nebuchadrezzar, rather than to its conquest by the Assyrians a long time before (as correctly noted by Hardmeier)⁽³²⁾.

(f) Telassar, Lair, Sepharvaim and Ivvah are located in eastern Babylonia⁽³³⁾. The site of Hena is unknown, but it may possibly be sought in the same area⁽³⁴⁾. Sepharvaim and Ivvah (Avva) are included in the list of peoples settled by Sargon in the province of Samerina (2 Kgs 17,24), and Sepharvaim is mentioned in Account B₁ (18,34) (see note 6 above). Lair is identical with Lahiru, a city located in northeastern Babylonia. It was an Assyrian province under the Sargonids, and is mentioned in numerous Neo- and Late-Babylonian texts⁽³⁵⁾.

The late date in which Account B₂ was written and the author's poor knowledge of the policy of Assyria is also revealed in 2 Kgs 19,17-18: 'It is true, o YHWH, that the kings of Assyria have laid waste the nations and their lands, and put their gods to fire...'. It is well known that the Assyrians usually treated the gods of the conquered nations with respect. Often the divine statues were brought to Assyria, where they were installed in chapels until sent home, and only seldom were they actually destroyed⁽³⁶⁾.

Is it possible that this passage reflects the Babylonian practice of destroying cult statues during their conquest of Assyria, and did the author again select an example familiar to his audience in order to illustrate his theology? In light of the long bitter enmity between Assyria and Babylonia, and the utter destruction of the royal cities of Assyria (e.g., Nineveh, Assur, Calah, Dur-sharrukin, Arbela) by the Babylonian-Median armies, the suggestion is certainly possible. Unfortunately, we do not know enough about

⁽³¹⁾ GRAYSON, *Chronicles*, 99, lines 6-10.

⁽³²⁾ HARDMEIER, *Prophetie im Streit*, 404.

⁽³³⁾ For Sepharvaim and Avva/Ivvah, see ZADOK, "Notes", 115, 120-123.

⁽³⁴⁾ Some scholars suggested transposing the letters of Hena (*Hēna*^c) and reading it 'Anah, i.e., the city of 'Anat (modern 'Āna) located on the middle Euphrates. See ŠANDA, *Die Bücher der Könige*, 260; S.E. LOEWENSTAMM, "Hena", *Encyclopaedia Biblica* (Jerusalem 1954) II, 852 (Hebrew); WILDBERGER, *Jesaja* III, 1424. The city of 'Anat was conquered by Nabopolassar when he subdued a rebellion that broke out in 613 BCE. See GRAYSON, *Chronicles*, 93-94, lines 35-36. However, there is no textual evidence for this suggestion, and we had better follow the MT and versions and assume that Hena is an unknown place in eastern Babylonia.

⁽³⁵⁾ J.A. BRINKMAN, *A Political History of Post-Kassite Babylonia 1158-722 B.C.* (AnOr 43; Rome 1968) 178, n. 1093; R. ZADOK, *Geographical Names according to New- and Late-Babylonian Texts* (Repertoire Géographique des Textes Cunéiformes 8; Beihefte zum Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients 7; Wiesbaden 1985) 208.

⁽³⁶⁾ M. COGAN, *Imperialism and Religion: Assyria, Judah and Israel in the Eighth and Seventh Centuries B.C.E.* (SBLMS 19; Missoula 1974) 9-41; COGAN – TADMOR, *II Kings*, 236; cf. P.-E. BEAULIEU, "An Episode in the Fall of Babylonia to the Persians", *JNES* 52 (1993) 243-261.

the Babylonian cultic policy towards the gods of Assyria. The main source we have is the Babylonian chronicle series, and although the chronicles appear objective, in reality their pro-Babylonian bias is revealed throughout their text⁽³⁷⁾. Even if the Babylonians destroyed Assyrian cult statues, the author would avoid mentioning it in his work.

It is well known that an earlier Mesopotamian cult statue that has been lost could be fashioned only on the basis of some model of the lost one. T.G. Lee demonstrated that Nabonidus reconstructed the lost statue of Sin of Harran by the image that was engraved on Ashurbanipal's cylinder seal, which he dedicated to the god Sin⁽³⁸⁾. This may indicate that Assyrian statues were indeed destroyed during the Babylonian conquest. The scope of destruction of cult statues is unknown, but the fact that the kings of Babylonia never mentioned the fate of captured Assyrian statues may indicate that the author of Account B₂ referred to events that happened not long before his time.

The Date and Place of Accounts B₁ and B₂

An analysis of the place names mentioned in Account B₂ indicates that its author knew some details of the Babylonian campaigns to northern Mesopotamia and Syria in the years 612-605 BCE. Moreover, he had specific knowledge of certain places in eastern Babylonia, such as the settlement of the Edenites in Telassar-Til Aššuri and the sites of Laḫiru and Hena. The attachment of Ivvah and Sepharvaim — the origin of the settlers in the province of Samerina — to Laḫiru and Hena may suggest that he was aware of their location in eastern Babylonia. We may safely assume that the author of Account B₂ lived in eastern Babylonia, where some other deportees from the places he mentioned lived, and they must have been his sources for the Babylonian campaigns to northern Mesopotamia.

Noteworthy also is the reference to the gods of the nations 'whom my ancestors destroyed (*šihātū*)' (v. 12). Ostensibly, the author is referring to Sennacherib's predecessors, the kings of Assyria. Assuming that, in reality, the text refers to the kings of Babylonia who conquered these places, the term 'my ancestors' indicates that Account B₂ was written after the time of Nabopolassar and Nebuchadrezzar, i.e., after 562 BCE. We may conclude that the author of the second prophetic story was a descendant of a Judean deportee living in Babylonia. He must have written his story after the death of Nebuchadnezzar, either in the time of the late Babylonian Empire or in the early Persian period. A date after the sixth century BCE is unlikely, since the author would then have drawn the historical episodes from more recent events, and the details of the Babylonian conquests in the late seventh century BCE would not have been kept in memory so accurately.

The author of Account B₂ expanded and elaborated the early story of Sennacherib's campaign and the 'miraculous deliverance' of Jerusalem (2 Kgs 18,13-19,9a.36-37) in accordance with his experience in the new place and the message he was trying to convey to his audience, the Judean deportees in

⁽³⁷⁾ ZAWADZKI, *The Fall of Assyria*, 114-143; N. NA'AMAN, "Chronology and History in the Late Assyrian Empire (631-619 B.C.)", *ZA* 81 (1991) 260-261.

⁽³⁸⁾ LEE, "Jasper Cylinder Seal", 131-136.

Babylonia. The updating of the list of conquered cities is part of his revision. He did not know much about the Assyrian conquests, which happened long before his time, apart from what he had read in the Deuteronomistic history. He therefore wrote a new list of places that were conquered not long before his time and were better known to his audience than the list of places that appears in Account B₁ (18,33-34). The exact historical background of the conquests and deportations was less important to him than the theological conclusions drawn from these events. The updated list of places suited his theological lesson of the helplessness of the foreign gods and the need to trust in YHWH in times of crisis and danger.

The attribution of an exilic date for Account B₂ is commonly accepted among scholars, but my suggestions for the location of the author and a possible date for his composition are new elements in the discussion. The marked difference between the authors of Accounts B₁ and B₂ is worth noting: the former selected his examples of the Assyrian conquests from Sargon II's campaigns, whereas the latter selected his examples from the Babylonian campaigns of the late 7th century BCE. In what follows, I will suggest two other differences between Accounts B₁ and B₂, which also indicate the enormous chronological gap between their respective messages.

(a) The second speech of the Rabshakeh in Account B₁ (2 Kgs 18,29-35) underlines the difference between YHWH of Jerusalem and the gods of Samaria. It could have been written only in the pre-exilic time, when Jerusalem and the temple were still intact and the memory of the destruction of the Northern Kingdom was very much alive. The author of Account B₁ drew conclusions from the 'miraculous deliverance' of Jerusalem in 701 BCE and conveyed the message that Jerusalem was different from all recently conquered places, including Samaria, since YHWH guarantees its safety.

The comparison between the fate of Samaria and Jerusalem is missing in Account B₂, having lost its validity after the destruction of Jerusalem in 587-586 BCE. Instead, the later author expanded the list of conquered places and contrasted the inability of their gods to protect their citizens with the power of YHWH to protect his people and their city.

(b) A second point of comparison is the emphasis on Assyria's power and impending threat in Account B₁, as against an abstract depiction of the enemy in B₂. Reading Account B₁, it is clear that the story was written when the memory of Assyria's enormous military power and its threat to the existence of the Kingdom of Judah was still very much alive. In Account B₂, on the other hand, Assyria appears as an abstract power, representing more the concept of a strong military power than a concrete historical entity. The story will remain the same if we replace the name Assyria with the name of another power (e.g., Babylonia, Persia). Here only the theological messages are considered important, hence the arena for the scene and details of the situation are described in the shortest and schematic manner.

Account B₁ was no doubt composed in the pre-exilic period. It seems to me that the author of 2 Kgs 18,13-19,9a.36-37 (the Deuteronomist) combined two early sources that were available to him: a chronistic text (the source of Account A), and a prophetic story of the 'miraculous deliverance' of Jerusalem (Account B₁). The chronistic text was written shortly after the conclusion of the Assyrian campaign, which is why its contents so accurately

match the text of Sennacherib's inscriptions⁽³⁹⁾. It may have been included in the so-called 'chronicles of the kings of Judah'. The story was probably transmitted orally for some time, but was composed in writing at a time when the memory of the power and impending threat of Assyria to the very existence of Judah was still very much alive. The reference to Tirhakah 'king of Egypt' in connection with the Assyrian withdrawal from Judah (18,9a, 19,36) indicates that when the story was written, Tirhakah's name was kept in memory in connection with the Assyrian-Egyptian struggle over the domination of Palestine⁽⁴⁰⁾. The vivid memory of the murder of Sennacherib by his sons (2 Kgs 19,37), including the names of the murderers, the circumstances of the murder, the place where they found shelter, and the name of Sennacherib's successor, all point to a relatively early date of composition. The struggle of Tirhakah (690-664) with Assyria and the murder of Sennacherib (681) are the earliest possible dates for the composition of Account B₁, which could have been written at any time after these dates.

Dating the composition of the Deuteronomistic history is disputed among scholars, and this is not the place to enter the discussion⁽⁴¹⁾. I have already suggested some arguments in support of a Josianic date of composition⁽⁴²⁾, and will restate here my conviction that the early comprehensive history of Israel was written in the time of Josiah.

The Deuteronomist combined the chronistic and narrative texts (Accounts A and B₁) into a continuous history and integrated them into his composition of the history of Israel. He worked the chronistic source and fitted it into the pattern of other closely related texts that described the campaigns of foreign kings and the payment of tribute (e.g., 1 Kgs 14,25-26; 2 Kgs 12,18-19; 15,19-20; 16,5,7-9). He copied almost verbatim the prophetic story, as he did with many other prophetic stories that were available to him⁽⁴³⁾. His main

⁽³⁹⁾ For a good summary, see P.E. DION, "Sennacherib's Expedition to Palestine", *Église et Théologie* 20 (1989) 5-25.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ J. von Beckerath suggested that Tirhakah could not have taken part in the 701 BCE campaign since he arrived in Palestine no earlier than 700 BCE, and possibly only in 696 BCE. See "Ägypten und der Feldzug Sanheribs im Jahre 701 v. Chr.", *UF* 24 (1992) 3-8; ID., "Die Nilstandsinschrift vom 3. Jahr Schebiktus am Kai von Karnak", *GM* 136 (1993) 7-9. However, the Egyptian chronology of the 25th Dynasty is still uncertain, as indicated by the new inscription of Sargon II discovered in Iranian Kurdistan. See G. FRAME, "The Inscription of Sargon II at Tang-i Var", *Or* 68 (1999) 52-54; D.B. REDFORD, "A Note on the Chronology of Dynasty 25 and the Inscription of Sargon II at Tang-i Var", *Or* 68 (1999) 58-60.

⁽⁴¹⁾ For short surveys of the different schools of thought, see E. EYNIKEL, *The Reform of King Josiah and the Composition of the Deuteronomistic History* (OTS 33; Leiden 1996) 7-31; P.S.F. VAN KEULEN, *Manasseh through the Eyes of the Deuteronomists*. The Manasseh Account (2 Kings 21:1-18) and the Final Chapters of the Deuteronomistic History (OTS 38; Leiden 1996) 3-52.

⁽⁴²⁾ N. NA'AMAN, "Historiography, the Fashioning of the Collective Memory, and the Establishment of Historical Consciousness in Israel in the Late Monarchical Period", *Zion* 60 (1995) 449-472 (Hebrew); ID., "Sources and Composition in the History of David", *The Origins of the Ancient Israelite States* (eds. V. FRITZ - P.R. DAVIES) (JSOTSS 228; Sheffield 1996) 180-183; ID., "Sources and Composition in the History of Solomon", *The Age of Solomon — Scholarship at the Turn of the Millennium* (ed. L.K. HANDY) (Leiden 1997) 76-80; ID., "Royal Inscriptions and the Histories of Joash and Ahaz, Kings of Judah", *VT* 48 (1998) 333-349.

⁽⁴³⁾ N. NA'AMAN, "Prophetic Stories as Sources for the Histories of Jehoshaphat and the Omrides", *Bib* 78 (1997) 153-173.

contribution to Account B₁ is the insertion of 2 Kgs 18,22, which he wrote in order to support and corroborate his description of Hezekiah's cultic reform (18,4)⁽⁴⁴⁾. The note on Hezekiah's cultic reform is the only place where a clear Deuteronomistic/Deuteronomistic features appears in the speech. It supports my suggestion that Account B₁ is a pre-Deuteronomistic prophetic story and that — like many other prophetic stories — it was integrated by the Deuteronomist into his work of the history of Israel.

The Deuteronomist attached Account B₁ after Account A, and omitted any reference to the subjugation of Judah to Assyria from 701 BCE to the Assyrian retreat from Palestine, thereby depicting Hezekiah's revolt against Assyria as an unqualified success. Anyone reading the Hezekiah-Josiah pericope in the Book of Kings would have to conclude that Judah was subjugated in the reign of Ahaz and was freed during the reign of Hezekiah. This is an exemplary case of the decisive role of the Deuteronomist in shaping the history of Judah according to his ideological and theological considerations, although he cited his two sources almost verbatim and added very little to the early texts.

Account B₂ was written in Babylonia, either in the late years of the Babylonian Empire or the early Persian period, and in many ways is a revised theological version of the first account. The prophetic story of the 'miraculous deliverance' of Jerusalem had a prominent place in the theology of the Deuteronomistic history, and the author of Account B₂ found it necessary to update it and fit its messages to the new experience of the Jewish community in Babylonia in the second half of the sixth century BCE⁽⁴⁵⁾.

Department of Jewish History
Tel Aviv University
Ramat Aviv
Israel

Nadav NA'AMAN

SUMMARY

The article re-examines some elements in Account B₂ (2 Kgs 19,9b-35) in an effort to shed more light on the date and place in which the story was composed. It is suggested that the list of cities mentioned in vv. 12-13 reflects the conquests of Nabopolassar and Nebuchadnezzar in the late seventh century BCE. It is also suggested that vv. 17-18 may reflect the Babylonian practice of destroying cult statues during their conquest of Assyria. The author of Account B₂ was probably a descendant of a Judean deportee who lived in eastern Babylonia in the second half of the sixth century BCE. It is further suggested that the Deuteronomist combined chronistic and narrative early texts (Accounts A and B₁) and integrated them into his composition of the history of Israel.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ N. NA'AMAN, "The Debated Historicity of Hezekiah's Reform in the Light of Historical and Archaeological Research", *ZAW* 107 (1995) 183.

⁽⁴⁵⁾ This is the seventh in a series of articles that discuss the problem of sources and composition in the books of Samuel and Kings. For earlier articles, see the literature cited in N. NA'AMAN, "The Contribution of Royal Inscriptions for a Re-evaluation of the Book of Kings as a Historical Source", *JSOT* 82 (1999) 5, n. 2.

A Note on the Personal Name Amon (2 Kings 21,19-26 || 2 Chr 33,21-25)

The reign of Amon (2 Kgs 21,19-26 || 2 Chr 33,21-25) has attracted a significant degree of interest from biblical historians over the years, mainly because of its laconic description of the young king's assassination which leaves us completely in the dark as to the precise circumstances of this event and the situation that provoked it⁽¹⁾. Amon is also remarkable in that he appears to have an Egyptian name⁽²⁾. We are not, however, offered any biographical information about him other than that he was 22 years old when he ascended the throne and that his mother, Meshullemeth, came from Jotbah (probably at-Taba, 30 km north of Aqaba)⁽³⁾. Amon's succession is usually dated to 642/641 BCE: Assuming the chronology and the given age of Amon as 22 years to be correct, this would mean that he was born in 664/663 BCE⁽⁴⁾.

Amon's father Manasseh, in contrast to Hezekiah, is generally reckoned to have been a loyal Assyrian vassal⁽⁵⁾. Indeed, Manasseh probably had very

⁽¹⁾ Various reconstructions of the causes of Amon's untimely death have been suggested: (i) Amon may have been assassinated at the behest of a newly resurgent Egypt as a result of his pro-Assyrian policy (A. MALAMAT, "The Historical Background of the Assassination of Amon, King of Judah", *IEJ* 3 [1953] 26-29), (ii) Amon may have been murdered by one of his elder siblings, disappointed at being passed over in the line of succession (M. COGAN – H. TADMOR, *II Kings* [AB 11; New York 1988] 276), (iii) The assassination was sponsored by a Yahwist faction wishing to see a revival of the Hezekian reform (E. NIELSEN, "Political Conditions and Cultural Developments in Israel and Judah During the Reign of Manasseh", *Proceedings of the Fourth World Congress of Jewish Studies* (Jerusalem 1967) I, 103-106. Without further evidence, the question must remain open, however.

⁽²⁾ Elsewhere, the name appears in 1 Kgs 22,26 || 2 Chr 33,22, where a certain Amon (אֲמֹן) is mentioned as governor of Samaria during the reign of Ahab. However, the LXX of this text reads Σαμ(μ)ηρ / Εμ(μ)ηρ, a fact which led B. STADE, "Der Name der Stadt Samarien und seine Herkunft", *ZAW* 5 (1885) 173-175, to conclude that we should read אֲמֹר for אֲמֹן in this particular location. The name also occurs in the phrase 'children of Amon' (בְּנֵי אֲמֹן) in Neh 7,59 referring to a group of those who returned to Judah under the leadership of Zerubbabel and Joshua. However, doubt is also cast on the authenticity of this Amon, since the same group of returnees are referred to in the parallel text in Ezra 2,57 as the 'children of Ami' (בְּנֵי אָמִי). This leaves 2 Kgs 21,19-26 || 2 Chr 33,21-26 as the only location where the reading אֲמֹן is certain. I am unable to locate any discussion of a Hebrew etymology for the name in scholarly works. However, if one does accept the preexistence of a Hebrew name 'Amon', a derivation from the root אָמַן 'establish, confirm, support' would seem likely (and, arguably, would render a meaning appropriate for a male child who would continue the family line). No material difference is made to the thesis of this article whether or not the preexistence of the name is accepted.

⁽³⁾ J. GRAY, *I & II Kings*. A Commentary (OTL; Philadelphia 1976) 711; G.W. AHLSTRÖM, *The History of Ancient Palestine from the Palaeolithic Period to Alexander's Conquest* (JSOTSS 146; Sheffield 1993) 734.

⁽⁴⁾ Among those who adopt the later date are E. STERN, "Israel at the Close of the Period of the Monarchy: An Archaeological Survey", *BA* 38 (1975) 28, and AHLSTRÖM, *The History of Ancient Palestine*, 739.

⁽⁵⁾ A few scholars, influenced by the account of Manasseh's reign in 2 Chronicles 33, maintain the possibility of a revolt by Manasseh, most likely in the context of the general

little choice in the matter given that he inherited a state comprised of little more than Jerusalem and its immediate environs⁽⁶⁾. The survival of Judah in any form depended on the good behaviour of its king, and Manasseh seems to have managed to recover much of the territory lost to Judah following Hezekiah's ill-fated rebellion⁽⁷⁾. Manasseh's loyalty to Assyria is demonstrated well enough in the Assyrian annals of Esarhaddon (681-668 BCE) which state that Manasseh and 21 other kings of Hatti (Syria-Palestine) were forced to provide building materials for Esarhaddon's new palace and transport them to Nineveh (ANET 291). Manasseh also accompanied Esarhaddon's successor on his first campaign against Tirhakah in Egypt in 667 BCE. The annals of Ashurbanipal state that 'During my march (to Egypt), 22 kings from the seashore, the islands and the mainland, servants who belong to me, brought heavy gifts (*tâmartu*) to me and kissed my feet. I made these kings accompany my army over the land-as well as (over) the sea-route with their armed forces...' (ANET 294). The names of these 22 kings are listed in Cylinder C, and among them is 'Manasseh (*Mi-in-si-e*), King of Judah (*la-û-di*)'.

Despite the success of this campaign, Assyria's hold over Egypt was challenged again three years later by Tirhakah's son Tanwetamani (664-656 BCE), who captured Memphis. The response of Assyria was swift and brutal. In 663 BCE, Ashurbanipal attacked Egypt and took Tanwetamani's capital, Thebes (Egyptian: Nî; Hebrew: נִי נִי⁽⁸⁾). The Assyrian annals make no mention this time of aid from vassal states; rather they stress the speed with which the Assyrian king reacted to the new insurrection ('URdamane heard of the approach of my expedition [only when] I had [already] set foot on Egyptian territory' [ANET 295]) — probably there was no time for a ceremonial progression through Syria-Palestine, although it is entirely likely that Assyria's vassals (including Judah?) on the route of Ashurbanipal's march were called on to render military aid once more. The fall of Thebes to Ashurbanipal in 663 BCE at any rate seems to have impressed Judahite contemporaries: Nah 3,8-10 preserves the memory of this event, predicting that one day Nineveh itself would fall as did Thebes.

Even if Manasseh himself was not fighting with his Assyrian overlord against a city called נִי נִי in 663 BCE, the fact that he chose to call the son born to him in this year נִי נִי suggests a relationship between these events. For

uprising against Ashurbanipal inspired by his brother Shamash-shum-ukin in 652 BCE (E. L. EHRLICH, "Der Aufenthalt des Königs Manasse in Babylon", *TZ* 21 [1965] 281-286; J. BRIGHT, *A History of Israel* [Philadelphia 1981] 311, 341). M. COGAN, *Imperialism and Religion*. Assyria, Judah and Israel in the Eighth and Seventh Centuries B.C.E. (SBLMS 19; Missoula 1974) 69, suggests that Manasseh may have joined an earlier rebellion of 22 western kings in 671 BCE which was put down by Esarhaddon during a previous campaign against Egypt. As NIELSEN, "The Reign of Manasseh", 104, observes however, had such an event occurred and Manasseh suffered capture and punishment, there seems little reason why the Deuteronomist would have ignored it.

(6) R. NELSON, "Realpolitik in Judah (687-609 BCE)", *Scripture in Context II*. More Essays on the Comparative Method (eds. W.W. HALLO - J.C. MOYER - L.G. PERDUE) (Winona Lake 1989) 181.

(7) AHLSTRÖM, *The History of Ancient Palestine*, 735; C.D. EVANS, "Manasseh, King of Judah", *ABD* IV, 497.

(8) AHLSTRÖM, *ibid.*, 747.

Ashurbanipal, the second Egyptian campaign was a critical moment in his reign, and confirmed his status (if only temporarily) as undisputed ruler of the known world. What better way for Manasseh, who had campaigned with Ashurbanipal against Tanwetamani's father Tirhakah, to flatter his master than to name the child who would be his eventual heir after the site of Ashurbanipal's latest military triumph(?)?

Department of Theology
University of Exeter
The Queens Building
The Queens Drive
Exeter EX4 4QH
United Kingdom

Dominic RUDMAN

SUMMARY

Manasseh's son Amon (Heb. אָמֹן) has what appears to be an Egyptian name. This article argues that Manasseh, who fought alongside Ashurbanipal on his first campaign in Egypt in 667 BCE, named the son born to him during Ashurbanipal's second campaign in 663 BCE as a flattering commemoration of his overlord's capture of the rebel capital Thebes (Heb. נִיאֹמֹן) in that year.

(?) Even if the Hebrew name Amon was already in existence by this time, its use may still have been suggested to Manasseh by news of the fall of Thebes.

Mark 15,39 and the So-Called Confession of the Roman Centurion

Ongoing studies of Mark's passion narrative reveal strong differences of opinion about the proper interpretation of Mk 15,39 and the use of the anarthrous $\nu\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ there. Some recent examinations of the text support the traditional view that the words of the centurion constitute a true confessional statement⁽¹⁾, whereas other research utilizing grammatical, textual and historical evidence contend that the words before the cross cannot be taken as a *crux interpretum* for Markan theology⁽²⁾. A re-examination of the Roman background of the centurion's exclamation continues to demonstrate that his statement cannot be understood as a full confession of Jesus as the Son of God in Mark's gospel⁽³⁾.

1. It is argued, for example, that the Latin *divi filius* (also without an article) demonstrates how it is possible to understand Mark's grammar in a definite sense as an acknowledgement of the divinity of Jesus. Mark's gospel, it is contended, stands as a challenge to the Roman imperial cult, the centurion's confession applying especially to Augustus, the emperor most likely to be worshiped as a god at the time Mark was written. 'The background information available on the diction employed in the incipit of the Gospel of Mark seems to suggest that the usage of the phrase that echoes the language of the Roman imperial cult in both 1,1 and 15,39 was deliberate and the phrase $\nu\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ must have challenged the intended Markan readers who were probably familiar with the practices of the state cult'⁽⁴⁾. '[T]o the author of the Gospel of Mark there was no doubt that the centurion confirmed the divine sonship of Jesus, marking the climax of the narrative'⁽⁵⁾.

Examination of the texts of 1,1 and 15,39 demonstrates, however, that this supposed 'double anarthrouness'⁽⁶⁾ cannot support the conclusion that

(1) TAE HUN KIM, "The Anarthrous $\nu\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ In Mark 15.39 and the Roman Imperial Cult", *Bib* 79 (1998) 221-241. S.K. STOCKKLAUSNER – C.A. HALE, "Mark 15:39 and 16:6-7; A Second Look", *McMaster Journal of Theology* 1 (2/1990) 34-44, argue for the traditional interpretation but argue that 16,7 is the true climax of the gospel.

(2) E.S. JOHNSON, Jr., "Is Mark 15:39 the Key to Mark's Christology?", *JSNT* 31 (1987) 3-22.

(3) For recent studies of the Imperial background of the gospels see C. BLACK, "Was Mark a Roman Gospel?", *ET* 105(1993) 36-41; W. CARTER, "Toward an Imperial Critical Reading of Matthew's Gospel", *SBLSP* (1998) I, 296-324; P.B. DUFF, "The March of the Divine Warrior and the Advent of the Greco-Roman King: Mark's Account of Jesus' Entry into Jerusalem", *JBL* 111(1992) 55-71; E.S. JOHNSON, Jr., "Mark 5:1-20: The Other Side", *IBS* 20 (1998) 50-74; B. KINMAN, "Parousia, Jesus' 'A-Triumphal' Entry, and the Fate of Jerusalem (Luke 19:28-44)", *JBL* 118 (1999) 279-294; T.E. SCHMIDT, "Mark 15:16-32: The Crucifixion Narrative and the Roman Triumphal Procession", *NTS* 41 (1995) 1-18.

(4) KIM, "The Anarthrous", 240.

(5) *Ibid.*, 241.

(6) This expression is used by R. GUNDRY, *Mark. A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross* (Grand Rapids 1993) 951.

both verses should be taken in the same light as Christian and confessional. If the grammatical basis for taking the confession in 15,39 as definite is shaky and uncertain since Mark's usage of anarthrous nouns does not demonstrate that $\nu\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ must be taken definitely⁽⁷⁾, the supposed corroboration of 'son of God' in 1,1 renders the interpretation even more untenable. In the *UBSGNT*, 'son of God' is only given a 'C' rating, indicating that the enclosed words in the text are those 'whose presence or position [...] is regarded as disputed'. In a thorough study, P.M. Head⁽⁸⁾ carefully reviews the reasons for doubt about the traditional reading in 1,1. As he demonstrates, text-critical evidence indicates that the original text of Mark probably did not include the disputed words. Based on the external evidence in wide ranging manuscripts and patristic citations, as well as internal evidence (the shorter text, for example, is obviously the more difficult reading and can easily be explained as an addition to buttress the church's Son of God theology), Head's conclusions must be taken into account: The original, shorter form of 1,1 was supplemented by many MSS with 'Son of God' in two different forms, probably around 100 AD. 'The scenario is more plausible than any other, it accounts for the other variants, and fits what we know of scribal habits and the tendency of gospel traditions'⁽⁹⁾. Without the support of the anarthrous $\nu\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ in 1,1 the case for taking 15,39 as definite is weakened considerably. The appealing symmetry of declaring divine sonship at the very beginning, the middle and the end of the gospel is lost. Jesus is declared the Son by the *bat qôl* at the baptism (1,11) and at the Transfiguration (9,7) but in both cases the title is clearly defined by the definite article. For Mark the clearest definition of Jesus' identity is provided only by the very voice of God, not by the author of the gospel in his introduction, and not by any character in the gospel. The confession of the centurion must be understood in some other way.

2. The conclusion that Mark must have had *divi filius* (as a Roman description of the Emperor) in mind in 15,39 in order to challenge Roman Imperial theology and Roman belief in Augustus as a god is also highly questionable⁽¹⁰⁾. It cannot be assumed that the indefinite *divi filius* must have been taken over into Mark's Greek. The Latin is an imprecise guide to Mark's intentions: since Latin does not have definite and indefinite articles to correspond to those in Greek, the meaning must always be determined by context⁽¹¹⁾.

Equally unconvincing is the contention that emperors after Augustus deliberately avoided the use of son of god to describe themselves, keeping that honor intact for the greatest emperor of them all, *Divus Augustus*. In fact, the Roman practice of granting divine status to the emperors was far more

(7) JOHNSON, "Is Mark 15,39?", 3-22.

(8) P.M. HEAD, "A Text-Critical Study Of Mark 1.1. 'The Beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ'", *NTS* 37 (1991) 621-629.

(9) *Ibid.*, 629.

(10) KIM, "The Anarthrous", 225,227.

(11) Thus Mark 1,1 is *Iesu Christi Filii Dei*; 1,11 is *Filius meus dilectus*; 9,6 [7], *Filius meus carissimus*; 15,39, *Filius Dei*. Cf. Jn 20,31 [30], *Filius Dei*.

complex than the mere use of *divi filius* or related terms⁽¹²⁾. 'In most cases it is impossible now to reconstruct exactly how any individual emperor negotiated the delicate boundary between (god-like) humanity and outright divinity' (13). Tiberius at times did accede to the urging of some to acclaim him a god, especially in the East⁽¹⁴⁾. A. Wardman demonstrates, moreover, that there were two distinct ways that deification could be accorded to emperors⁽¹⁵⁾. The Augustan Model (adopted by Augustus and Tiberius) sought to give the impression of being a reluctant ruler or recipient of divine honors. The Augustan, Wardman demonstrates, is modest about his own religious claims while being punctilious in securing divine honors for his own family or close relatives (as Augustus claimed them for Julius Caesar, his uncle, and Tiberius for Augustus). The Augustan Emperor makes it clear that he has a high regard for venerated Roman tradition and presents frequent sacrificial offerings on a royal scale. Normally these leaders were universally accorded divine status after their deaths. As Wardman points out, even Tiberius was not intentionally effective in his protestations, and he ended up receiving the titles he had first refused⁽¹⁶⁾. D. Fishwick further demonstrates the inconsistency of the Augustan. Tiberius and Claudius both relaxed their refusal of divine honors and allowed temples to be built in their honor when it suited their purposes and were worshiped as deities during their own lifetimes⁽¹⁷⁾.

Wardman designates the second mode of emperor deification as the Antonian Model (influenced by the Egyptian concept represented by Mark Anthony and Cleopatra). In this form the emperor or leader appears as a god in public and makes divine claims intentionally obvious, like Caligula standing

(12) See, for example, D. CUSS, *Imperial Cult and Honorary Terms in the New Testament* (Freibourg 1974), esp. p. 31. 'Even in its original form, the imperial cult was very much more complicated than would appear at first glance. Augustus was not divine in himself, and officially it was his Genius that was adored during his lifetime, but an absolute prohibition of the worship of the person of the emperor was not practical in the provinces or even in Italy outside of Rome, as Augustus was soon to discover [...] At Rome, Augustus was at pains to link up the newly-established emperor-cult with the traditions rooted in the Republican era, in order to supply an ideal for the masses while respecting those men who were wary of the innovations which were not firmly rooted in the past'.

(13) M. BEARD – J. NORTH – S. PRICE, *Religions of Rome* (Cambridge 1998) I, 209. The authors warn against the general use of the expression 'the imperial cult', contending that there is no such thing (much as New Testament scholars would be reluctant to use the word 'gospel' to mean the same thing in regard to the first four books); 'rather, there was a series of different cults sharing a common focus in the worship of the emperor, his family or predecessors, but [...] operating quite differently according to a variety of different local circumstances — the Roman status of the communities in which they were found, the pre-existing religious traditions of the area, and the degree of central Roman involvement in establishing the cult' (ibid., 318). Also see 208-210; 252-253; 359-361.

(14) As KIM, "The Anarthrous", 233, also admits.

(15) A. WARDMAN, *Religion and Statecraft Among The Romans* (Baltimore 1982) 90-107.

(16) Ibid., 93.

(17) D. FISHWICK, "The Development of Provincial Ruler Worship in the Western Roman Empire", *ANRW* II.16.2 (1978), 1201-1253, see esp. 1211, 1217. For Tiberius' somewhat contradictory attitude see CUSS, *Imperial Cult*, 33-35. Emperors and members of their families were usually given divine honors by vote of the senate after their deaths, usually based on a perception of merit. Almost all of the deified emperors had temples erected in their honor (following the precedent set for the divine Caesar). See BEARD – NORTH – PRICE, *Religions of Rome*, I, 209, 253.

between his brother-gods Castor and Pollux, or Commodus dressing up as Hercules. The Antonian flaunts religious orders by destroying religious buildings or by refusing to have them repaired, by failing to observe the traditional religious calendars, or by having statues erected to his own honor in precious metals. As Wardman concludes, 'It would be difficult to get complete agreement on a list of Antonians, but it would certainly include, for one reason or another, Caligula, Nero, Domitian, Commodus, Caracalla and Elagabalus. The tradition accuses nearly all of them of religious presumption, in claiming identity with a god' ⁽¹⁸⁾.

In both cases, the populace eventually views the emperor as divine. In Mark 15,39 the use of the indefinite *υἱὸς θεοῦ* provides little evidence and no certitude to substantiate the conclusion that this statement is a challenge to a particular emperor. It could have been to Augustus, Tiberius, Claudius, Nero, Caligula or even Vespasian or Titus (depending upon the date of composition); it could have been a challenge to all of them at once; or, as is more likely, to none at all.

Supposing that Mark was trying to draw a contrast between the declaration of the emperor as a god and Jesus as the Son of God through the use of the soldier's confession is made even more problematic when the complexity of Roman concepts of divinity in general is taken into account. An emperor could be worshiped as a son of god not only by being given the title but by being granted divine status through the worship of his *Genius*.

A deeply religious people, the Romans attributed their dominion over the world to their piety and care for the gods. The most Roman of these, and some of the most widely worshiped ones, were [...] the multitude of the more shapeless powers and spirits that held in their care every action and event, every person and every place. To these belong the *Genii*. Their cult was overwhelmingly popular [...]

A new major cult of the *Genius* in the public sphere emerged with the establishment of the Empire. The *Genius Imperatoris* or *Genius Augusti* was the key vehicle of emperor-worship, the religious acknowledgement of the imperial order. In this, the army was definitely to the fore — its monuments to the *Genius* of the Emperors are so numerous that they reflect a particular attachment of the army to their supreme commanders, even if one allows for the unusually rich documentation from the army camps ⁽¹⁹⁾.

Religion in the army, moreover, went beyond the worship of the emperor as a god.

The cult of the standards, the use of the sacred oath (*sacramentum*), the importance of the military religious calendar ⁽²⁰⁾, the veneration of various

⁽¹⁸⁾ WARDMAN, *Religion and Statecraft*, 92-93. See BEARD – NORTH – PRICE, *Religions of Rome*, I, 209.

⁽¹⁹⁾ M.P. SPEIDEL – A. DIMITROVA-MILČEVA, "The Cult of the *Genii* In the Roman Army and a New Roman Deity", *ANRW* II.16.2 (1978) 1542-1543.

⁽²⁰⁾ J. HELGELAND, "Roman Army Religion", *ANRW* II.16.2 (1978) 1471-1505.

abstractions (virtues) such as *Eirene*, *Themis*, *Pax*, *Concordia*, *Virtus* ⁽²¹⁾ and Victory ⁽²²⁾, as well as the importance of specific military *Genii*, demonstrates the multiplicity of images that the 'confession' of the centurion might have raised in the minds of readers who were familiar with Roman religious practices. An inscription cited by Hegeland is of particular interest. It is significant for its reference to the Deities of several emperors.

To the Deities of the Emperors and the Genius of the Second Legion August, in honor of the eagle, the senior Centurion gave this gift ⁽²³⁾.

What the expression *ὁὸς θεοῦ* on the lips of the Markan centurion means cannot be determined with any precision.

3. The traditional interpretation of the centurion's statement at the foot of the cross as text critical to Markan theology has also been supported from another perspective. 15,39 is not only the interpretative key to Mark's Christology, but is the narrative and Christological climax as well ⁽²⁴⁾. The Markan Jesus fulfills the Christological paradox: through the gospel a man demonstrates what God can do. Appearing to dismiss grammatical concerns about the anarthrous *ὁὸς θεοῦ*, it has been argued that the intended reader of Mark would not search out other anarthrous predicate nouns which precede the verb in order to clarify the problem; rather he would read 15,39 consistently with previous references to Jesus' sonship to God ⁽²⁵⁾.

Naturally it is not suggested that Mark's readership was made up of grammarians. But language and the way it is used, precisely or imprecisely, is important. If nothing else, it impacts translation and the way the author's interpretation is passed on to future readers. P. Harner indicates the difficulty which Mark's grammar presents.

It is doubtful whether any English translation can adequately represent the qualitative emphasis that Mark expresses in 15,39 by placing an anarthrous predicate before the verb. Perhaps the verse could best be translated, 'Truly this man was God's son'. This has the advantage of calling attention to Jesus' role or nature as son of God. It minimizes the question whether the word 'son' should be understood as definite or indefinite. At the same time it leaves open the possibility that Mark was thinking of Jesus at this point as 'a' son of God

⁽²¹⁾ See J.R. FEARS, "The Cult of Virtues and Roman Imperial Ideology", *ANRW* II.17.2 (1981) 827-947.

⁽²²⁾ J.R. FEARS, "The Theology of Victory At Rome", *ANRW* II.17.2 (1981) 736-826.

⁽²³⁾ HELGELAND, "Roman Army Religion", 1477; *CIL* VII, 103. Also see *CIL* II, 6183, 'To Juppiter Optimus Maximus, a vexillation of the legion VII Gemina Felix under the direction of Junius Victor a centurion of this same legion for the birthday of the eagle'. It is noteworthy that Roman soldiers also participated in more than the manifold worship opportunities connected with Imperial theology. Frequently local gods were worshiped as part of their strategy of conquest. As E. Birley notes, the worship of local gods may have been precautionary. If you get the gods on your side you may be able to overcome them. See E. BIRLEY, "The Religion of the Roman Army: 1895-1977", *ANRW* II.16.2 (1978) 1506, 1541, esp. 1525.

⁽²⁴⁾ P. DAVIES, "Mark's Christological Paradox", *JSNT* 35 (1989) 3-18.

⁽²⁵⁾ DAVIES, "Mark's Christological Paradox", 11. See a similar comment by R.E. BROWN, *The Death of the Messiah*. From Gethsemane to the Grave. A Commentary on the Passion narratives in the four Gospels (New York, 1993) II, 1148.

in the hellenistic sense, or 'the' son in a specifically Christian sense, or possibly both. In all of these ways the translation 'God's son' would reflect the various shades of meaning that may be present in Mark's word-order⁽²⁶⁾.

At some point decisions must be made for translation, unless a long footnote is to accompany the modern text. Is Jesus in Mark 15,39 'The Son of God', 'a son of God' or 'a son of god'? Is it likely that Mark meant all at once, as Harner implies?

It is argued that it is clear throughout the gospel who Jesus is. If that is correct, one wonders if the confession of the centurion is so necessary at the end as it is often implied. There is little question among scholars that Mark's is a Son of God theology⁽²⁷⁾; little question that Mark and the readers in his church believed him to be so; one hopes that there is little question about the faith of scholars who debate the significance of Mark 15,39. The question after all, is not whether Mark believes and demonstrates that Jesus is the Son of God, but if he does so in 15,39.

Certainly there are other places where Jesus is designated the Son (with a definite article). But in every instance other than the *bat qôl* at the Baptism and Transfiguration, they are all false starts. The other references to Jesus' sonship demonstrate who Jesus is *not*, rather than who he is, even if they are with the definite article. The demons, for Mark, are not ones who are worthy to make a definition of Jesus (1,24; 3,11; 5,7). Evil spirits are not the ones who confess the true nature of God's Son; they are rebuked and silenced (1,25; 3,12)⁽²⁸⁾. Likewise, the High Priest's statement about Jesus is also to be disregarded. Jesus may agree that he is the 'Son of the Most Blessed' (14,61), but he redefines it in the correct terms with citations of Ps 110 and Dn 7,13. Jesus, furthermore, is not 'the King of the Jews' either; certainly not as Pilate sarcastically defines the title (15,2.12.26), or the king the soldiers mockingly abuse in a parody of the salutation to the emperor (15,18). Jesus is not even 'the Christ', or 'the King of Israel' as his religious detractors sneer out at him (15,32).

One scholar concludes that '[t]he issue, after all, is not what Mark's readers thought of the centurion and his faith; it is what they were to think of Jesus' (29). A good point and well stated. Yet, in Mark's story, it is important how the readers regard characters around Jesus. How readers understand the witness of God, of John the Baptist, of King Herod, of Peter in Caesarea Philippi, of Bartimaeus, has a powerful impact on their definition of who Jesus

⁽²⁶⁾ P.H. HARNER, "Qualitative Anarthrous Predicate Nouns: Mark 15:39 and John 1:1", *JBL* 92 (1973) 81. BEARD – NORTH – PRICE, *Religions of Rome*, I, 359, ask an intriguing question about emperor worship. Noting the close connection between government and religion in Rome, they wonder if Roman religion had 'real religious significance' at all? The attempt to distinguish between Roman cults which were political and those which were genuinely spiritual might be entirely illusory.

⁽²⁷⁾ In the past *The Son of Man* has often been considered an important Christological title for Mark. Recent studies, however, reduce it to non-titular significance, GUNDRY, *Mark* 118-119; R.A. GUELICH, *Mark 1-8:26* (WBC 34A; Dallas 1989) 89-91.

⁽²⁸⁾ The demoniac from Gerasa is allowed to 'preach' because the demons have been driven out and destroyed, 5,19-20. For a recent examination of the Roman background of this pericope see JOHNSON, "Mark 5:1-20", 50-74.

⁽²⁹⁾ DAVIES, "Mark's Christological Paradox", 15.

really is. The centurion's ambiguous statement does not lend itself to the final illumination of Jesus' identity and his true relationship to God remains a mystery to the disciples, the bystanders at the crucifixion, and the women who seek him after his raising. God's testimony alone provides the true answer (1,11; 9,7): Jesus is the beloved Son.

4. Ched Myers provides important sociological insights which further weaken the insistence that Mark 15,39 must be interpreted as a full Christian confession of Jesus as the Son of God. Heretofore, his arguments have not been given the recognition they deserve. Myers argues (a) that to put such a realization on the lips of a Roman soldier, the very one presiding at Jesus' execution⁽³⁰⁾ not only gives the man more credit than he deserves, it clearly betrays an imperial bias. It is an attempt to suppress political discourse in favor of theology. (b) There are no clues which indicate that the centurion has been converted (or represents the position of a converted Roman). The scene begins with the centurion 'standing over against' Jesus on the cross and such spatial tension usually indicates opposition (cf. 6,48; also I Thess 2,15) not solidarity. This same man reports back to his superior that Jesus is indeed dead (15,44-45.) and is not heard from again. (c) The centurion's solemnity does not carry particular weight (ἀληθώς) since Mark has previously put this same exclamation on the lips of Jesus' enemies (12,14; 14,70). As is demonstrated in 3,11; 5,7; 6,3 and 14,61, the title the centurion uses does not represent a confession at all, but [may present] a hostile response to Jesus by those who are trying to gain power over him by naming him. (d) The only difference between the centurion's statement about Jesus and that of the High Priest is that Jesus can no longer respond. So it is up to the reader to discern who Jesus really is. If we continue to insist that the centurion's 'confession' is the correct one, then 'we will have failed to learn one of the most salient lessons of the whole story, which is that those in power indeed 'know who Jesus is', and are out to destroy whereas those who follow him are often unsure who he is, but struggle to trust him nevertheless'.

* * *

The text of Mark 15,39 and the so called 'confession' of the Roman centurion has been given more weight than either can bear. Although it is true that Jesus is the Son of God to Mark it is not demonstrated in the introduction, by the demons or Jesus' enemies. Jesus' true identity is only revealed out of the mouth of God (1,11; 9,7) and in the hearts of readers who know what the gospel characters do not fully realize.

The continuing debate about the proper interpretation of Mark 15,39 is reminiscent of the attempts over the years to force-feed an interpretation of the Messianic Secret into Markan theology. For more than 50 years scholars took some form of the Secret as a given. Now it is rarely even mentioned in the introductions of modern commentaries except perhaps as a hermeneutical curiosity. The sense that somehow Mark 15,39 must be interpreted as a full confession may spring from our own deep belief that Jesus is the Son, and fear

⁽³⁰⁾ Ch. MYERS, *Binding the Strong Man. A Political Reading of Mark's Story of Jesus* (Maryknoll 1991) 393-394.

that understanding it differently there will undermine that keystone of our faith.

To say that the centurion serves as a symbol for the incipient promise of Jesus in 13,10 that the gospel will be preached to all the nations⁽³¹⁾ is to make of him a kind of *deus ex machina* or a rabbit out of a hat, who conveniently appears out of nowhere, ties up all of our questions and all of Mark's loose ends. But the gospel does not allow itself to be interpreted or outlined in such a manner. Mark's original text is the one which has no reference to the Son in 1,1; he provides the anarthrous *υἱὸς θεοῦ*; he is the one, as far as we know, who has written an unusual ending, completing his gospel with an enigmatic *γάρ*, pushing readers into the community of faith to find the answers to the riddles he poses. If that is where Mark goes, we have no choice but to follow him there.

First Presbyterian Church
Johnstown, New York
U.S.A.

Earl S. JOHNSON, Jr.

SUMMARY

Continuing examination of the grammatical, literary and historical evidence indicates that the centurion's remarks about Jesus in Mark 15,39 cannot be understood as a full Christian confession of Jesus' divine sonship, and cannot be taken as a direct challenge to any Roman emperor in particular. Jesus' identity in the gospel is not revealed by the centurion, the demons, the disciples or in the introduction to the gospel. It is made clear by God's declaration that he truly is the Son (1,11; 9,7), and in the faith of the readers as they search for Jesus' presence in their own community.

⁽³¹⁾ As BROWN, *The Death of the Messiah*, 1149, argues.

‘The Apostles Whom He Chose because of the Holy Spirit’ A Suggestion Regarding Acts 1,2

There is practically universal agreement that in, Acts 1,2, διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου means ‘through the Holy Spirit’, ‘by means of the Holy Spirit’; this phrase could, with a thought appropriate to the Holy Spirit, be better expressed thus: ‘under the influence of the Holy Spirit’. Such is understood to be the force of διὰ with the genitive.

As regards the syntax of Acts 1,2, scholars have two suggested readings regarding διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου. Some would see διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου as modifying the participle ἐντειλάμενος, and thus would read the phrase: ‘having given orders through (i.e., under the influence of) the Holy Spirit’⁽¹⁾. Others would understand διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου to belong with ἐξελέξατο and so would read the phrase: ‘whom he chose through (under the influence of) the Holy Spirit’⁽²⁾. Each of these readings is possible — certainly each is grammatically possible, using the usual sense of διὰ with the genitive.

The problem here is primarily one of sense, but also one of grammar. That is, if one agrees grammatically that διὰ with the genitive can only mean ‘through’, ‘under the influence of’, then one is well on the exegetical path that makes one interpret the διὰ phrase with either ἐντειλάμενος or with ἐξελέξατο in quite hypothetical ways.

For instance, one can, in regard to the first of the opinions above, assert that Jesus gave orders while under the influence of the Spirit, but one would be hard put to find any sure indication from the Gospel (especially Luke 24) that Jesus gave any orders at any time ‘under the influence of the Holy Spirit’. Yes, there is always the early description of Jesus to reflect upon: ‘And Jesus returned to Galilee in the power of the Holy Spirit’ (Luke 4,14); and one must always make allowance for the constancy of the Spirit in his adult life: ‘The Spirit of the Lord is upon me ... He has anointed me’ (Luke 4,18). But that these texts are the justification for saying that Jesus gave orders (we are dealing with the latter verses of Luke 24) while under the influence of the Holy Spirit is an argument that rates the qualification ‘possible’, but not much

⁽¹⁾ Cf. F.F. BRUCE, *The Acts of the Apostles*. The Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary (Grand Rapids, 1990) 99; J.D.G. DUNN, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Epworth Commentaries; London 1996) 6; P. BOSSUYT – J. RADERMAKERS, *Témoins de la Parole de la Grâce*. Lecture des Actes des Apôtres (Institut d’Études Théologiques 16; Brussels 1995) II, 98; C.K. BARRETT, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (ICC; Edinburgh 1994) I, 69; H. CONZELMANN, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (HNT 7; Tübingen 1963) 24.

⁽²⁾ J. ROLOFF, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (NTD 5; Göttingen 1981) 19; R. PESCH, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (EKKNT 5; Zurich 1986) 61, n.11; E. HAENCHEN, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (MeyerK 3; Göttingen 1965) 145-146; J. DUPONT, *Les Actes des Apôtres* (SBJ; Paris 1964) 239; I.H. MARSHALL, *The Acts of the Apostles* (TynNTC; Grand Rapids 1980) 57; G. SCHNEIDER, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (HTKNT; Freiburg im B. 1980) I, 193 n. 33; A. WIKENHAUSER, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (RNT 5; Regensburg 1961) 24; A. WEISER, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Gütersloh 1985) 49.

more⁽³⁾. Undoubtedly, it is always possible that Luke, in a second volume, means to include a detail now which he did not include when he provided the same basic narration at an earlier time. But, after some reflection, one is left with a certain dissatisfaction if one reads Acts 1,2: 'having given orders under the influence of the Holy Spirit'. One simply does not understand that, in the resurrection chapter, Jesus was under the influence of the Spirit when he ordered⁽⁴⁾ his apostles to 'stay in the city till you are clothed in power from on high' (Luke 24,49).

Again, in the second of the above suggestions, the matter is immediately one of grammar and of sense. No doubt, the phrase διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου can, despite its position⁽⁵⁾, modify ἐξελέξατο. But the problem brought against the first opinion can be brought now against this second opinion. In the story of Jesus' choosing the Twelve (Luke 6,12-16), there is no reference to the influence of the Holy Spirit upon Jesus. True, he is described at prayer all night⁽⁶⁾. This detail, coupled with the remarks noted above at Luke 4,14 and 4,18, might justify a later statement, that 'under the influence of the Holy Spirit, Jesus chose the apostles'. But again the conclusion drawn is 'possible', but little more.

Finally, one more rightly, on the basis of sentence structure, should choose in favor of the second of the two opinions cited above. The reason for this preference is the flow of the sentence⁽⁷⁾. If, as the first opinion suggests, one links in thought ἐντειλάμενος, ἀποστόλοις and διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου, while all the time keeping the Lucan word-order, one ends up with a very precariously dangling clause οὗς ἐξελέξατο which appears to be a last-minute addition. Whereas, if one links in thought ἀποστόλοις, διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου and οὗς ἐξελέξατο, one has a comfortable thought unit, which gives emphasis to either the third or second of its elements. Luke often shifts forward words he wishes to stress⁽⁸⁾. It seems more reasonable, from the structural point of view, to read διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου with οὗς ἐξελέξατο. But given the difficulties noted above regarding this way of reading Acts 1,2, the structural argument helps one only in a small measure.

⁽³⁾ J. FITZMYER, *The Acts of the Apostles* (AB 31; New York 1998) 196, notes, when commenting on his understanding of διὰ with ἐντειλάμενος, 'Christ uses God's Spirit in the instruction of his apostles after his death and resurrection. Cf. Matt 28,19-20'. This comment is true, if the traditional interpretation is accepted, something which this essay contests.

⁽⁴⁾ Here is the only real order Luke could possibly refer to from the Gospel.

⁽⁵⁾ BRUCE, *Acts*, 99, points to 'the unnatural separation of οὗς ἐξελέξατο from τοῖς ἀποστόλοις'. Certainly, 'unnatural' cannot be understood to mean non-Lucan.

⁽⁶⁾ WEISER, *Apostelgeschichte*, 49, suggests that διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου can modify ἐξελέξατο because Jesus would have chosen his apostles under the influence of the Spirit, which influence resulted from his lengthy prayer.

⁽⁷⁾ Cf. FITZMYER, *Acts*, 196: 'That [διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου modifies ἐξελέξατο], however, unduly forces the flow of the Greek text, and there is no mention of the Spirit in the choice of the apostles in Luke 6:12-13'.

⁽⁸⁾ Cf. Acts 1,10; 3,19; 4,33; 5,13; 7,35; 9,14; 12,25; 16,14; 19,4.10. Note F. BLASS – A. DEBRUNNER, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. A Translation and Revision of the Ninth-Tenth German Edition Incorporating Supplementary Notes of A. Debrunner by Robert W. Funk (Chicago 1961) 248 (no. 472,2): 'Any emphasis on an element in the sentence causes that element to be moved forward'.

A Suggestion

Given the difficulty in choosing either of the traditional understandings indicated above⁽⁹⁾, I would propose a third option. It has to do with both grammar and sense. First, grammar. The Grammar of Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich observes, 'At times διὰ w. gen. seems to have causal mng.'⁽¹⁰⁾ Examples are given: from Romans (8,3) and 2 Corinthians (9,13)⁽¹¹⁾. So we do find this usage of διὰ with the genitive in the New Testament; it is an admittedly rare usage, and not found in Luke-Acts. Yet, rare as it is, it does exist, and so can be, grammatically speaking, a possible reading here.

The sense of this usage of the preposition presents a two-fold question. First, what does διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου modify? I would apply it to the οὗς ἐξελέξατο clause, which indicates that Jesus chose his apostles 'because of the Holy Spirit'.

Second, what would be the meaning of this reading? Luke had concluded his resurrection chapter with a look to the future, to the gift of the Holy Spirit 'from my Father', to be received soon in Jerusalem. It is a gift to be sent upon 'you'. 'You are witnesses of these things'. 'As for you, you stay...' The reader looks forward to the apostles' reception of this promise.

Once Luke begins his second volume, logically he refers first to his first volume, then in particular to the deeds and teachings of Jesus recounted therein, and finally to the last-mentioned item of that volume: the day of Jesus' being taken up. But as he prepares his reader for this second volume, he also notes, in the present understanding of the text, that the apostles were chosen because of the Holy Spirit. That is, they were chosen 'then' to be given 'soon now' the Holy Spirit. Of this choice, and its purpose, Luke explicitly reminds his reader⁽¹²⁾. And in a manner typical of Luke, he three times, at the beginning of Acts, brings to the reader's attention, in a short space of time, this coming of the Spirit upon the apostles: vv. 2, 5 and 8.

Thus, instead of asking the reader to think that Jesus had been under the influence of the Spirit when he chose his disciples at Luke 6,12-16, or even to think that his giving orders at Luke 24,49 was under the inspiration of the Spirit, Luke, I suggest, is asking his reader to recall, at Acts 1,2, one of the

⁽⁹⁾ WIKENHAUSER, *Apostelgeschichte*, 25, is one of a few exegetes who would claim, because of the difficulties the traditional understandings occasion, that διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου is an insertion into the already established Acts text. Quite opposed to this opinion, with his reasons, is J. ZMIJEWSKI, *Apostelgeschichte* (RNT; Regensburg 1994) 47.

⁽¹⁰⁾ W. BAUER, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. A Translation and Adaptation of the Fourth Revised and Augmented Edition of Walter Bauer's Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur by William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich (Chicago 1952) 179.

⁽¹¹⁾ Cf. BAUER, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 179-180.

⁽¹²⁾ It is difficult to say that the Gospel's ἐκλεξάμενος ... οὗς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν (Luke 6,13) is not meant to be recalled by τοῖς ἀποστόλοις ... οὗς ἐξελέξατο (Acts 1,2). It seems fair to say that Luke's manner of expressing himself – 'having chosen from them twelve, whom he also called apostles...' – suggests a desire to emphasize the apostolicity of the Twelve, not only as it is found in Luke 9,1-6, but as it will be taken up in a much more profound way in Acts. It is in this latter volume that one will learn how the apostles were chosen to be filled with the Holy Spirit; they were chosen because of the Spirit.

central elements of the Gospel story: he chose his apostles because one day they should wait for the coming of the Spirit.

It seems reasonable, then, to think that Luke began his second volume with the reminder that Jesus had given orders to his apostles *because of* the imminent coming of the Holy Spirit.

Given the difficulties of the traditional interpretations of διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου (Acts 1,2), and the fitting sense given the text if the preposition be understood to mean 'because of' — a sense allowed to διὰ with the genitive, inside and outside the New Testament — it seems reasonable to translate Acts 1,2: 'until the day when, having given orders to his apostles whom he had chosen because of the Holy Spirit, he was taken up'.

Pontifical Biblical Institute
Via della Pilotta, 25
I-00187 Roma

John J. KILGALLEN, SJ

SUMMARY

In Acts 1,2 Luke has placed 'through the Holy Spirit' between two verb forms, the participle 'having given orders' and the verb 'he had chosen'; suggestions have been offered over the years as to which of these two verb forms 'through the Holy Spirit' is supposed to modify. In this note, there is offered a fresh suggestion to resolve this syntactical problem; moreover, with this suggestion Luke's intention is better clarified.

RECENSIONES

Vetus Testamentum

Martin J. MULDER, *1 Kings*. Vol. I. 1 Kings 1–11 (Historical Commentary on the Old Testament). Leuven, Peeters, 1998. xxix-604 p. 16 x 24. BF 2.100

This detailed commentary is part of the explicitly historical-critical series, Historical Commentary on the Old Testament. As such, it deliberately sets itself off from the interpretive world of the present reader's encounter with the final form of the text and focuses instead on matters of history, grammar, text, and lexicography. This approach grows out of a conviction expressed in the Editorial Preface: '[T]he Old Testament originated in a human society which, with respect to the basic realities of the human condition, was not so very different from our own ... It is only by concentrating on the specificity of that thoroughly historical revelation ... that we can hope to grasp the uniqueness of the faith of ancient Israel' (ix). The commentary is a translation of one on chapters 1–7 that appeared in the series *Commentaar op het Oude Testament* (1987), supplemented by Professor Mulder's posthumous manuscript on the remaining chapters.

The approach is meticulous and detailed. It is conservative in the sense that it restricts itself to matters of text, syntax, word study, paying only limited attention to sources and redaction. In the introduction, Mulder reviews current hypotheses about the origin and redactional history of *Kings*, but finds it unnecessary for his purposes to take sides. He simply affirms that *Kings* made use of earlier historical and literary sources for its own theological purposes. It might be said that, rather than offering an interpretation of its own, this commentary presents the user with abundant raw materials for the construction of an interpretation. Such an approach seems especially well suited for the early chapters of *Kings*, in which so much source material appears with its attendant obscurities and difficulties.

Each division of the text is presented in an original translation, followed by an "Introduction", usually of a page or less, that sets forth the overall meaning and significance of the unit. Verse-by-verse exegesis makes up the overwhelming bulk of the comment. The nature of this volume can best be grasped by comparing its presentation of three passages: the tale of the two mothers, the list of Israel's administrative districts, and Solomon's deuteronomistic temple dedication prayer. Comment on the tale of Solomon's wise judgment (3,16-28) takes up eight pages. The translation is informal ('once upon a time,' 'the other woman spoke up'). Mulder remarks in passing that the tale is 'folkloristic,' but provides no literary or cross-cultural analysis. There are isolated references to the dramatic effect of individual verses. However, the focus is on text-critical issues and what the vocabulary and syntax communicate. There is a word-study on

'prostitute.' The retelling of the tale by Josephus is referred to at several points. Useful observations from older commentaries (such as Thenius, Ehrlich, and Stade-Schwally) are preserved for a twenty-first century readership. The overall impression is that of a sequence of scattered observations without a unified focus of interpretation.

In contrast, Mulder uses twenty-five pages to comment on the list of Solomon's district governors (4,7-19). A map is provided along with a concise description of the nature of this administrative system and Solomon's possible motives. The contentious question of Judah's absence or presence is highlighted, but only briefly. Most attention is paid to the extent of district territories and the identification of place-names. The disputed territory of Hephher is located near the seacoast. Recurring references to the transmission of place-names in the ancient versions and Josephus will likely seem superfluous to many readers. It is concluded that the original catalogue was a succinct listing of personal names and place names, to which have been added various redactional and secondary glosses.

Finally, the comment on Solomon's temple dedication prayer (8,14-61) focuses almost entirely on individual elements rather than on its elegant overall structure or the theological intent of any deuteronomistic authors or redactors. Instead, the commentary repeatedly directs readers interested in such matters to the recent study of E. Talstra, *Solomon's Prayer. Synchrony and Diachrony in the Composition of I Kings 8,14-61* (Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology; Kampen 1993).

Perhaps the most valuable and certainly the most interesting pages in this volume have to do with the description of Solomon's temple, its decorations, and its furnishings (7,13-51; seventy-five pages). Here Mulder's approach shows its true worth, as he takes up the innumerable lexical and syntactical problems present in a source text that was probably not well understood even by the biblical author who utilized it. Comparative material and rigorous analysis of language connect the temple's architecture, its detached symbolic pillars, bronze sea, and iconographic ornamentation to the religious and mythic themes of Israel's neighbors. In a similar way, the ungainly wheeled water-stands had a mythic symbolic function connected to rain and fertility. In the end, it is proposed that Solomon's sanctuary involved a reuse of an older Jebusite temple of El.

Because it does not focus to any great degree on larger issues, this commentary gives the impression of being somewhat scattered and atomistic. Some users will miss attempts to separate literary layers and redactions. Others may wish for greater attention to matters of plot, structure, and theological intent. However, the rigorously historical and philological approach offered in this volume is an important and valuable reminder that all convincing interpretation must proceed from just such a basic, foundational level. One often gets the impression that many contemporary readings of biblical texts suffer from insufficient attention to just these matters. This commentary is highly recommended as an antidote to any such scholarly inattentiveness.

Roland E. MURPHY, *Proverbs* (WBC 22). Nashville, TN, Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1998. lxxvi-306 p. 16 x 23,5. \$32,95.

Richard J. CLIFFORD, *Proverbs. A Commentary* (OTL). Louisville, KY, Westminster John Knox Press, 1999. xvi-286 p. 16 x 23.

Ces deux commentaires paraissent aux États-Unis à quelques mois de distance, en attendant celui de Michael V. Fox que l'un et l'autre annonce. R.E. Murphy, qui, au terme d'une longue vie académique (ix), n'a rien perdu de sa vigueur, s'est imposé depuis des décennies comme un des meilleurs connaisseurs de la sagesse biblique; dans la même collection, il a commenté l'Ecclésiaste en 1992. R.J. Clifford joint à son intérêt pour le courant sapientiel une compétence en orientalisme et on lui doit une étude comparative sur les récits de création, parue en 1994. Leurs commentaires des Proverbes sont comparables et, sur plus d'un point, complémentaires. Si celui de R.E. Murphy est plus volumineux, c'est qu'il offre la traduction complète du livre (xxi-lxxv) avant d'en analyser les péricopes et qu'il ajoute, en fin de volume (251-294), une série d'excursus; pour chaque péricope, il fournit également la bibliographie récente. Alors que R.J. Clifford dialogue le plus souvent avec les principaux commentateurs des dernières décennies, R.E. Murphy offre une présentation critique des monographies les plus récentes. De ce point de vue, son commentaire fait un bon état des questions actuelles, tandis que celui de R.J. Clifford, plus sobre, a peut-être un plus grand souci d'originalité, s'appuyant sur l'étude philologique du texte lui-même. La sagesse du Proche-Orient ancien, dans son rapport avec Proverbes, est présentée par les deux auteurs, mais R.J. Clifford s'attache davantage à la sagesse mésopotamienne; c'est d'ailleurs de celle-ci qu'il tire son interprétation de Pr 8,30: le terme difficile ~~נִסִּי~~ renverrait à l'accadien *ummānu* et se traduirait par «un sage», tandis que R.E. Murphy, sur base de la LXX et de Sg 7,22; 8,6, garde le sens d'artisan. Pour la sagesse égyptienne, en particulier celle d'Aménémopé, si les deux auteurs reconnaissent évidemment l'influence de cette dernière sur Pr 22,17-24,22, ils l'évaluent différemment: R.E. Murphy fait montre d'une extrême prudence (291-294), alors que R.J. Clifford, toutefois avec réserve, en vient à proposer jusque dans sa traduction faite d'affilée de ces «Paroles des sages» la répartition de leur contenu en trente unités, les deux auteurs lisant d'ailleurs «trente» en Pr 22,20. Au sujet de la Maat, tous deux se montrent également sceptiques (Murphy, 289-290; Clifford, 14).

Chacun des deux commentateurs divise le livre selon les collections qui le composent. Certaines de celles-ci reçoivent une explication globale. Chez R.E. Murphy, Pr 1-9 fait l'objet de réflexions conclusives (62-63); Pr 10-22,16, d'une introduction, fondée surtout sur l'étude de R. Sclorick (64-69). R.J. Clifford distingue davantage les unités qui constituent Pr 1-9 et offre une introduction spéciale pour les sections suivantes: Pr 10-22,16 (108-109), Pr 22,17-24,22 (199-200), Pr 25-29 (219-220) et Pr 30 (256-258). Une telle diversité étonne un peu, en particulier la discrétion des auteurs sur l'ensemble de Pr 1-9.

Pour chaque péricope, — les chapitres comme tels, quitte à bien distinguer les collections des sages et celles qui occupent Pr 30-31 —,

R.E. Murphy présente, après une bibliographie, sa traduction (dont il expose les principes en excursus, 251-254), des notes philologiques, une vue générale («Form/Structure/Setting»), un commentaire par verset ou par groupe de versets et une explication plus générale. R.J. Clifford fait de même pour la traduction, les notes critiques (l'hébreu y est translittéré) et le commentaire (sauf pour Pr 31,1-9, présenté globalement, 270-271); mais, s'il introduit soigneusement chaque unité de Pr 1-9, avec deux excursus, sur Pr 8,22 dans la tradition et sur ~~פס~~ en Pr 8,30 (98-101), il se contente ailleurs du commentaire verset par verset, hormis les introductions signalées plus haut et celle qui présente Pr 31,10-31 (272-274). Ainsi, plus de cohérence chez l'un, plus de souplesse chez l'autre.

Comparons à présent les explications données sur deux textes des Proverbes. Tout d'abord le banquet de la Sagesse en Pr 9,1-6. R.J. Clifford y ajoute explicitement le v.11, mais cela fait difficulté en hébreu, car les vv. 5-6 s'adressent à plusieurs, alors que le v. 11, comme les vv. 4 et 12, vise une seule personne. En 9,6, les deux auteurs conservent le sens abstrait pour ~~פס~~ et R.E. Murphy va jusqu'à écrire, en note, que la différence entre le sens abstrait, «simplicité», et le sens concret, «les simples», est négligeable. Est-ce si sûr? À propos du verbe de 9,1b, la note philologique de R.J. Clifford est lumineuse, mais celle de R.E. Murphy confond ~~פס~~ et ~~פס~~.

Pour celui-ci, la question d'une dépendance vis-à-vis du motif du banquet, par exemple dans l'épopée ougaritique de Keret, est oiseuse. La maison de la Sagesse doit être le livre même des Proverbes. C'est aux portes de la ville que la Sagesse enverrait ses servantes. Le repas offert rappelle Is 55,1-3, aux colorations sapientielles, mais une nuance érotique est aussi perceptible à la lumière de Ct 5,1, ce dont je doute. Pour R.J. Clifford, par contre, les parallèles ougaritiques sont probants et la Sagesse de Pr 9 devient l'antithèse de la déesse Anat. Is 55,1-7 est également invoqué, de même que Si 15,3; 24,21 et Jn 6,35-40. Quant aux sept piliers, il hésite à suivre J. Greenfield qui préfère voir une allusion aux sept sages mésopotamiens d'avant le déluge; ces piliers supportent le palais, une grande maison. Le banquet célébrerait l'achèvement de la construction de cette demeure de la Sagesse. Les invités seraient de la ville haute, où se situent les palais.

A mon sens, les parallèles extrabibliques et bibliques ne sont pas négligeables. Il s'agit bien d'inaugurer la nouvelle maison de la Sagesse, qui n'est autre que le livre des Proverbes. Au banquet, tous sont invités, car la demeure est vaste. Je croirais que l'archéologie peut apporter sa lumière, à partir de ces maisons dont les chambres entourent une cour intérieure où des colonnes supportent un toit, ce qui suppose un étage. S'il y a sept piliers, c'est que la cour est grande et peut recevoir beaucoup de monde.

Venons-en au portrait de la femme forte en Pr 31,10-31. Le passage le plus difficile est le v. 30b. R.E. Murphy le traduit: «Fear of the Lord in a woman, that is to be praised», et R.J. Clifford: «it is for revering Yahweh that a woman wins praise». Curieusement, ce second commentateur ne note aucune explication textuelle à sa traduction. Au v. 31a, les deux auteurs adoptent l'emploi du verbe ~~פס~~, célébrer, exalter. De façon plus générale, ils acceptent l'un et l'autre de voir dans ce poème alphabétique la structure

littéraire qu'avait relevé en 1982 M. Lichtenstein (que R.J. Clifford ne nomme pas). La thèse de A. Wolters, de 1988, selon laquelle ce poème est un hymne (ou un *encomium*, précise R.J. Clifford) est acceptée de part et d'autre. De plus, les deux auteurs excluent qu'il s'agisse du portrait d'une femme réelle. Il s'agirait, selon R.J. Clifford, d'une épouse idéale, mais en même temps de la Sagesse, et, pour R.E. Murphy, de la Sagesse. L'un et l'autre renvoie à l'étude de T. McCreesh, de 1985, mais les différents arguments présentés par celui-ci pour fonder ce symbolisme de la Sagesse me paraissent peu convaincants et je le montre ailleurs. Enfin nos deux commentateurs voient un rapport entre ce poème et Pr 9,1-6. Ce qui m'étonne, c'est le peu d'effort fait pour montrer le réalisme du portrait, que A. Wolters ne devrait pas exclure avec sa thèse de l'hymne. En particulier, on ne trouvera chez eux guère de détails nouveaux sur la fabrication des tissus et vêtements.

Les excursions finaux de R.E. Murphy concernent quelques thèmes courant à travers le livre des Proverbes: la crainte du Seigneur, le discours, richesse et pauvreté, la rétribution, l'apport de Pr à la théologie, la femme et ses représentations en Pr. Ces excursions font le point de travaux récents et notre auteur, en les analysant, ne manque pas de bons sens. Je relève, en particulier, ses remarques sur le féminisme et Pr. Ces excursions donnent bien à penser.

C'est une chance d'avoir, presque en même temps, ces deux commentaires. Au lecteur de les laisser dialoguer en les écoutant et en cherchant à se faire soi-même sa propre idée. En tout cas, R.E. Murphy et R.J. Clifford nous ont rendu un fier service.

Via della Pilotta, 25
I-00187 Roma

Maurice GILBERT

John N. OSWALT, *The Book of Isaiah. Chapters 40–66* (The New International Commentary on the Old Testament). Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge, UK, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998. xviii-755 p. 16,3 x 24,3. \$48.00 – £32.99

El presente amplio comentario, segunda parte de su comentario a Isaías 1–39 (*The Book of Isaiah*. 1. Chap. 1–39 [NICOT; Grand Rapids 1986]) presenta en la cubierta la imagen de *Abraham y los tres ángeles* del Tiepolo (Museo del Prado). No he encontrado ninguna explicación de esta elección, al menos llamativa. Se puede imaginar que quiera expresar la intención de ofrecer una rigurosa lectura canónica de Isaías (cf. 4), que incluye, en principio, todo posible contacto del texto con el Antiguo y el Nuevo Testamento.

Llama también la atención, y tiene mayores consecuencias, la selección de la bibliografía. De aproximadamente 480 títulos citados en 20 páginas de bibliografía especial sobre Isaías 40–66, cerca de 30 corresponden a los años 1986 y siguientes, y de ellos solo 12 han sido publicados después de 1991. Los autores más citados son Westermann (174 veces) y R.N. Whybray (131),

seguidos a considerable distancia por Delitzsch (98), Muilenberg (92) y J.A. Alexander (72). Poco más o menos cincuenta veces se cita E.J. Young, C.R. North, A. Pieper, Duhm y E. Kutscher. La bibliografía especial sobre el Siervo de Jahvé a propósito de Is 42,1-4 (113-115) incluye sólo tres títulos entre 1981 y 1984, y ninguno más reciente. La bibliografía selecta sobre Is 53 (408-410) presenta un único título posterior a 1985. Como es tristemente habitual en el mundo académico bíblico anglosajón, el autor ignora — probablemente en el sentido estricto de la palabra — casi todas las contribuciones en italiano y español, aunque encuentra espacio para citar artículos que son decididamente de divulgación.

La insuficiencia bibliográfica se revela particularmente negativa para la discusión de la naturaleza y composición del libro de Isaías, un tema que se ha desarrollado fuertemente a partir de la mitad de los años ochenta y que dura hasta el presente. Oswalt asume una posición de minoría cuando considera que todo el libro del profeta Isaías ha sido escrito por el profeta del siglo octavo. Si en algún momento deja abierta la posibilidad de atribuir a un redactor (del tiempo del profeta Isaías) la totalidad del libro, más frecuentemente atribuye la composición al profeta mismo.

Su posición se apoya más sobre argumentos teológicos que propiamente exegéticos (incluyendo en esta categoría las discusiones sobre redacción y composición). El punto decisivo de su argumentación es la imposibilidad de afirmar una diversidad de autores entre Is 1-39 e Is 40-66 a partir del vocabulario o del estilo. La única razón por la cual se supone un autor diferente para la segunda parte sería "una previa convicción de que Isaías de Jerusalén no podía haber conocido el futuro por un camino sobrenatural" (5). La propia concepción de Oswalt de la profecía como anuncio del futuro no encuentra justificación adecuada en la breve introducción al comentario (3-6, sobre la composición del libro). Era necesario explicar, al menos, qué sentido podía tener que Isaías de Jerusalén hablara «a gente del futuro y no solamente acerca de ellos» (ibid., énfasis del autor).

Es difícil concebir cómo un mensaje tan detallado — como Oswalt pretende que sea — sobre el tiempo del exilio fuese dirigido a un pueblo que no se encontraba en la situación del exilio o del post-exilio y que por tanto no tenía acceso al mensaje; y al contrario es igualmente difícil imaginar de qué modo un mensaje encerrado en un libro viejo de 150 años podía afectar a un pueblo, en el exilio o en Jerusalén en tiempos del exilio, que no vivía del estudio de la Sagrada Escritura. Si se piensa en cambio en una verdadera proclamación de esa palabra, no se ve tampoco una dificultad para atribuir la proclamación al autor del texto, «inspirado» o no por el texto de Is 1-39.

Oswalt afirma marginalmente que es inverosímil que el autor o los autores de Is 40-66 hubieran procurado borrar toda huella de su propia presencia, y se hubieran disimulado bajo el escrito de Isaías de Jerusalén. Todo el problema de los escritos anónimos, de la pseudonimia y de los epígrafes editoriales en la Sagrada Escritura es simplemente dejado de lado, y el autor se conforma con interpretar Is 40,1-11 como una extensión de Is 6.

También teológicamente argumenta Oswalt cuando interpreta en sentido literal la prueba de la divinidad del Dios de Israel que propone Is

40-55: su capacidad de anunciar las cosas presentes y futuras antes de que existieran. Este «anuncio» se encuentra solamente en Isaías de Jerusalén. Si él no fuera también el autor de la segunda parte del libro, el argumento no tendría ninguna fuerza concreta. Jahvé no habría anunciado nada, y sería tan poco confiable como los ídolos. En el mismo sentido argumenta a propósito de Is 45,2 («quién ha anunciado esto desde *tiempos antiguos*» [222]). Sólo la atribución del texto a Isaías de Jerusalén permitiría hablar de este modo.

Una recensión no es el lugar para una discusión detallada sobre una problemática tan amplia como la del autor y composición del libro de Isaías, una discusión que se haría tanto más enojosa porque no se podrían discutir argumentos detallados sino afirmaciones amplias, que suponen un concepto totalizante de la revelación, de la profecía y del sentido mismo de la Sagrada Escritura.

Supuesta la unidad del autor para todo Isaías, y por consiguiente, básicamente, para el texto de Is 40-66, la organización del contenido resulta luego simple y evidente. En cualquier hipótesis de composición se debe reconocer que el trabajo «editorial» sobre Is 40-66 ha sido cuidadoso, de manera que no hay cortes, incoherencias o desarmonías evidentes. Una única discusión más detallada ofrece Oswalt (14) sobre la posibilidad de dividir Isaías 40-66 en tres grandes secciones, delimitadas por la repetición casi literal del refrán «No hay paz para el malvado, dice el Señor/mi Dios» en Is 48,22 y 57,21. Oswalt opta justificadamente por la división mayor tradicional entre Is 55 e Is 56. Las división interna en estas tres grandes secciones, según la tendencia más frecuente del último tiempo, prefiere establecer unidades mayores con nuevas subdivisiones, y siempre a partir del contenido del texto.

El comentario mismo responde a las características de la colección (NICOT), que procura integrar el rigor académico de la exposición, tanto en el aspecto histórico como exegético, con una visión de la Escritura como Palabra de Dios, y con la atención a la vida de fe de la comunidad y del lector del comentario. Esta concepción explica la presencia frecuente de expresiones o párrafos de tipo parenético (95, 118, 132 entre otros muchos) o referencias teológicas apoyadas sobre el Nuevo Testamento (108, 216, escogidas al azar). Esto ayuda a una lectura fluida y agradable del comentario. Pero la integración no es siempre fácil, y más de una vez la lectura teológico-pastoral asume el control del comentario, y sus criterios deciden cuando la exégesis todavía no ha dicho una palabra más convincente. Así ocurre, por ejemplo, cuando se afirma de modo decisivo: «mi posición es que en estos pasajes [los Cantos del Servidor] Isaías está hablando de un individuo, casi ciertamente el Mesías, que será el Israel ideal» (108).

Parece justificado a partir de argumentos exegéticos afirmar una distinción entre un servidor «anónimo» y el servidor «Israel» (véase mi propia exposición en el TWAT V, 1003-1010 [1984-1986]). Oswalt retoma Duhm y observa con acierto que hay un «cambio de ambiente» en los cuatro tradicionales «cantos» del Siervo en comparación con los otros pasajes donde se habla del siervo Israel. La distinción no es siempre clara en Oswalt. Así, por ejemplo, en la explicación del difícil pasaje Is 42,18-

25, comenzando por la traducción del v. 19a («Who is blind, except my servant»), donde la comprensión de *kî ʾim*, “except” como restrictivo parece dejar al «siervo» fuera de la categoría de los ciegos, en contradicción con el v. 19b y siguientes. Oswalt menciona «dos siervos» de los cuales se hablaría en el texto (130). Aunque la afirmación sea aceptable, los argumentos propuestos no son suficientes, y la interpretación del pasaje requiere explicar más las relaciones entre los versículos (véase mi propia interpretación del conjunto en mi breve comentario *Isaías* [Comentario al Antiguo Testamento II; Madrid 1997] 79-80)). En todo caso, la identificación del Siervo con el Mesías requiere una discusión más adecuada, teniendo en cuenta los puntos de vista aportados por publicaciones de los últimos 15 años.

El autor manifiesta sin embargo, más de una vez, una aguda sensibilidad de intérprete, como cuando, por ejemplo, y también aquí contra la mayoría, interpreta Is 41,17-20 en sentido «figurativo» o «no literal» (95). El estudio de E. Farfán Navarro, *El desierto transformado* (Roma 1992) lo hubiera ayudado a apoyar y circunscribir sus afirmaciones.

El comentario se mueve frecuentemente entre una desconfianza hacia los argumentos técnicos (lingüísticos, exegéticos, históricos y culturales), presentados brevemente y sumariamente desechados con un «no es imposible... pero», y una inclinación a retener como última afirmación lo que «aparece» en una primera lectura religiosa del texto, evitando una discusión más puntualizada y una opción más decidida. Las difíciles imágenes de Is 42,1-4, por ejemplo, decisivas para la interpretación del pasaje y de la figura del Siervo, son tratadas de este modo. Esta actitud puede estar plenamente justificada a nivel personal, pero no es lo que espera encontrar el estudioso que abre un comentario para profundizar el sentido de un texto.

La impresión de conjunto es que este comentario, cuya composición ha requerido probablemente no pocos años, como ocurre con las obras monumentales, haya cerrado el archivo bibliográfico en un determinado momento, sin interés, energía o tiempo para seguir de modo sistemático la discusión de algunos problemas, y añadiendo circunstancialmente algunos títulos más recientes. Esto ha impedido fundamentar mejor muchas afirmaciones. Queda como pregunta abierta — aunque *contra factum non sunt argumenta* — si es posible y útil continuar escribiendo, al menos en el estilo tradicional, comentarios totales sobre los libros más largo de la Biblia, que han dado origen a una bibliografía en la práctica inabarcable.

El comentario se cierra con numerosos índices muy valiosos, de materia, autores citados, textos bíblicos y términos hebreos, que aumentan la facilidad de uso y la utilidad de la obra.

Es difícil descubrir algún error tipográfico en el texto. Llama la atención por eso la mención de *Das alttestamentliche Deutsche* (14), obviamente *Das Alte Testament Deutsch*. En la bibliografía se han deslizado más errores, en particular en títulos no en inglés.

Pontificio Instituto Bíblico
Via della Pilotta, 25
I-00187 Roma

Horacio SIMIAN-YOFRE S.J.

Benjamin D. SOMMER, *A Prophet Reads Scripture*. Allusion in Isaiah 40–66 (Contraversions: Jews and other differences). Stanford, CA, University Press, 1998. xiv-355 p. 16,2 x 23,6. Hardback: £30.00 – \$49.50

This study by Sommer on Deutero-Isaiah has a striking title: *A Prophet Reads Scripture*. This title, actually, has a historicizing character. Deutero-Isaiah is portrayed as a concrete author who consciously makes connections with older texts which are already part of what can be called 'scripture', or perhaps even 'canon' — the word 'scripture' in the title is after all used in the singular — in his own literary work. This suggestive character of the title is not accidentally chosen, but fits in well with one of the results of Sommer's research on allusion in the work of Deutero-Isaiah.

Sommer situates his research in the framework of 'intertextuality'. This movement in literary studies is primarily a synchronic approach to textual relationships between different texts, an approach in which no account is taken of the possible historical contexts. Adopting intertextuality, Sommer seeks a close connection with the pioneering work of Ziva Ben-Porat on how such relationships could be described. The key question here, however, is always: which sound criteria does a scholar have at his disposal to decide whether there is an intertextual relationship or not?

Just as Ben-Porat's criteria cannot really be considered as sound, neither can Sommer's. Sommer works with three characteristics: sound-play, word-play and word-order. The first characteristic belongs to semantic phonetics, the second belongs to semantics as well and the last leans towards syntax. Using these characteristics, Sommer distinguishes a number of intertextual relationships of which the most important are: *allusion* and *echo*. In view of these terms it is directly clear that the first intertextual relationship is weightier than the second.

Sommer's criteria raise several questions in my mind. Firstly the question has to be posed as to the soundness of the criteria. Criteria for allusion should be chosen so that they can make a distinction between text-passages which form an allusion and text-passages which do not, bearing in mind that the recognisability of allusion does not depend on any coincidental associations made by an arbitrary reader. The criteria, therefore, should not play a role *after* one has decided upon an allusion but *before* one decides upon it.

A second interesting question has to be posed as to the connection between (forms of) semantics and syntax. Similarity in sound only is not sufficient, of course, to allow one to speak of an allusion. With this obvious general rule, however, the question of when similarity in sound as a distinctive criterion may be put forward in the search for allusion is not solved.

Finally, the question as to what the essential difference is between the various types of intertextual relationship has to be posed as well. What exactly distinguishes an *allusion* from an *echo*?

I was faced with these questions in my own dissertation and research on intertextual relationships between Isa 56–66 and Isa 40–66 (*Analogies*

in *Isaiah*. Volume A: *Computerized Analysis of Parallel Texts between Isaiah 56–66 and Isaiah 40–66* [Applicatio 10A] i-xii.1-302; Volume B: *Computerized Concordance of Analogies between Isaiah 56–66 and Isaiah 40–66* [Applicatio 10B] i-vii.1-702 [Amsterdam 1998]). To guarantee the soundness of the criteria, my research resulted in a set of formal — or interactively adaptable — rules to be put into a computer in order to decide whether an intertextual relationship is present or not. When this is done, exegesis is of course not finished, but all the observed relationships are submitted to consistently applied criteria. Furthermore, I formulated these rules so that the primacy of syntax over semantics, which has been demonstrated by linguistics, is guaranteed. In this way, it emerges that there is no essential distinction between ‘quotations’, ‘allusions’, ‘echoes’ or whichever name may exist for a more or less intrinsic intertextual relationship. I have introduced, therefore, one single name for all possible relationships, namely: *analogy*.

It is a pity that Sommer bases his methodological knowledge of intertextual relationships almost exclusively on an article by Ben-Porat going back to 1976. During the nineties, there have been publications on this subject as well, and not only my own dissertation. Because of the title of Sommer’s study, *A Prophet Reads Scripture*, some scholarly attention to the reading act itself within intertextual relationships might be expected; this feature, however, is regrettably lacking.

Sommer describes accurately and in an orderly manner the intertextual relationships which he has observed, in particular at the level of the lemma and the phrase. These descriptions may certainly help the user of Sommer’s study.

From the synchronic method of ‘intertextuality’, Sommer wishes to move on to the historical question. This question, in fact, is Sommer’s main interest. He considers the formulated criteria of sound-play, word-play and word-order as author-characteristics of Deutero-Isaiah. This means that, using these stylistic criteria, he is able to determine whether a text is written by Deutero-Isaiah or not. In his study, this leads to two insights. First, chapters 34 and 35 (sometimes, Sommer speaks only about chapter 35) must be considered as by Deutero-Isaiah as well. Sommer does not present this insight as new, of course, but as demonstrated in a new way. In his study, Sommer deals in fact with Isa 34–35, 40–66, despite the mention of only chapters 40–66 in the subtitle. The second insight perceives that the way allusions are made in Isa 40–55 does not differ from the way they are made in 56–66. Because of this, he considers Deutero-Isaiah as the single author of 40–66. Discussing this issue, he poses the intriguing question whether a ‘Third Isaiah’ ever existed. In an appendix to his study, he discusses this subject in more detail.

On the basis of his beliefs about Deutero-Isaiah, Sommer relegates the idea of anything like a *Jesaja Schule*, on the one hand, to the realm of fantasy. On the other hand, however, the same beliefs cause him to consider the ‘First Isaiah’, besides Deutero-Isaiah, as a historical person, with the proper name ‘Isaiah ben Amos’, as well.

The introduction of a historical moment in the study of intertextual relationships supposes that the one text is older than the other text. This

assumption is already present in the title of Sommer's study. Deutero-Isaiah makes use of texts and traditions which he has at his disposal. It is not about a single tradition, but a multitude of traditions. This re-use of older texts by Deutero-Isaiah has a dual purpose. The first may be denoted by the term 'historical recontextualization'. To convey a new message, worded in the text of Deutero-Isaiah, Deutero-Isaiah adapts an older text to a new one by using allusions. The second purpose can be described as the fulfilment of previous, older prophecies. Deutero-Isaiah considers himself as the one who speaks about the realisation of, for example, the doom-prophecies of Jeremiah, but in particular of 'First Isaiah' himself.

This, Sommer's historical view on the Book of Isaiah, comes strongly to the fore in a sentence on p. 105: 'Deutero-Isaiah may have seen himself as the successor of Isaiah ben Amos and his prophecies as a contribution of those in the first part of the scroll'.

Much as though I personally see something in favour of giving up the likes of a *Jesaja Schule* and a 'Third Isaiah', Sommer's assumption surprises me and raises a number of — unanswered — questions. The first question plays a role on the methodological level and asks how exactly can we make a transition from synchrony to diachrony? This question is all the more important, because intertextuality is originally a synchronic approach. Moreover, this question is meaningful because it is not a priori clear what the presence of an intertextual relationship — as an allusion — says, of its own accord, about textual diachrony unless the historical sequence of the texts has already been determined (or presupposed).

Sommer's opinion on the identity of Deutero-Isaiah is even more likely to involve such a circular argument. Just by starting with Isa 40–66 from a historical point of view, this text becomes, so to speak, automatically a literary unity for which a single literary author is posited. Next, this single literary author is not identified as an *implied author*, which would be correct, as current in literary theories on reading and texts, but as a historical author of flesh and blood.

This quotation proves that Sommer makes no distinction between a literary continuation and a historical continuation. Because of this, for Sommer, the non-existent literary transition from Deutero-Isaiah to Trito-Isaiah must be the same as a non-existent transition from the historical background of Isa 40–55 to the historical background of Isa 56–66. From actual insights on what a text is and the fact that there is no one-to-one relation between the text and the world outside the text (for instance: history), such a continuation is not possible or justifiable any more.

It is understandable, that a 'Third Isaiah' is superfluous in Sommer's vision of Isa (34–35) 40–66. I miss, however, any exegetical discussions with Sommer's predecessors here. From the six main studies on allusion and the Third Isaiah — A. KLOSTERMANN, *Deuterjesaja*. Hebräisch und Deutsch mit Anmerkungen (Sammlung hebräisch-deutscher Bibeltexte mit kritischen Anmerkungen 1; München 1893); A. ZILLESSEN, "'Tritojesaja' und Deuterjesaja: eine literarkritischen Untersuchung zu Jes 56–66", ZAW 26 (1906) 231–276; K. ELLIGER, *Deuterjesaja in seinem Verhältnis zu Tritojesaja* (BWANT 3/9; Stuttgart 1933); H. Odeberg, *Trito-Isaiah (Isaiah 56–66)*. A Literary and Linguistic Analysis (UUA 1; Uppsala 1931); W.

ZIMMERLI, "Zur Sprache Tritojesajas", *Schweizer Theologische Umschau* 20 (1950) 110-122; and A. MURTONEN, "Third Isaiah — Yes or No? Review article of Karl Pauritsch, *Die neue Gemeinde: Gott sammelt Ausgestoßene und Arme (Jesaia 56-66)*", *Abr-Nahrain* 19 (1980/81) 20-42 — only the last two are mentioned, whereas Sommer's standpoint looks very much like the position of Zillesen in 1906. During just the last five years too many developments have taken place in the exegesis of Isaiah, both from a synchronic viewpoint and a diachronic point of view, to simply identify Deutero-Isaiah as Isa (34-35, 40-66).

Sommer's opinion on the 'redaction history' of the *book* of Isaiah (i.e. the *text* of the book Isaiah), based upon his intertextual relationships, cannot be considered as comprehensive, nor can it serve as a basis for understanding the transition from the disappearance of prophecy after the Babylonian exile to a new form of religious expression; it might be fruitful, however, in furthering reflection on the synchronic unity of the book of Isaiah and the diachronic development of what is now the single book of Isaiah.

Sommer's study is splendidly edited and special attention is given to the layout. It is a pity that this series places the notes at the end of the book instead of at the foot of the page. The monograph concludes with an exceedingly functional survey of the intertextual relationships between Isa 34-35, 40-66 (for Sommer: Deutero-Isaiah) on the one hand and other texts on the other hand. These are divided into four 'source texts', namely: Isaiah (for Sommer: Isaiah ben Amos; traditionally called 'First Isaiah'), Jeremiah, Psalms and other texts (mainly the Pentateuch and Ezekiel). These relationships are indicated verse by verse. They are, however, not distinguished any more into different types of intertextual relationships. The monograph also contains a bibliography and two indices, one of bible texts and one of authors.

Yerwijkselaan 5
NL-6571 CM Berg en Dal

Archibald L.H.M. VAN WIERINGEN

Novum Testamentum

Jeffrey T. TUCKER, *Example Stories. Perspectives on Four Parables in the Gospel of Luke* (JSNTSS 162). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1998. 444 p. 16 x 24. £55.00 – \$85.00

L'exégèse des paraboles de Jésus a depuis longtemps pour principal objet les genres littéraires. Le point de départ de cette discussion est la théorie de A. Jülicher que certains ont acceptée, d'autres ont rejetée, mais que personne n'a pu contourner. C'est en effet Jülicher qui a introduit la distinction entre *Gleichnis*, *Parabel* et *Beispielergählung*, distinction qui a sans aucun doute déterminé la recherche sur les paraboles au cours du XX^{ème} siècle. Or, cent ans après la publication de l'ouvrage complet de Jülicher (*Die Gleichnisreden Jesu* Freiburg/Br. 1899), on peut se demander si les catégories littéraires qu'il a appliquées aux paraboles sont encore valables. J.T. Tucker en doute, et les raisons qu'il apporte ne sont pas des moindres.

L'étude de Tucker, version révisée d'une thèse doctorale dirigée par M.A. Tolbert, insiste sur les problèmes posés par la catégorie «récit exemplaire» (*Beispielergählung*) appliquée par Jülicher à quatre péripécopes de l'évangile de Luc: le bon Samaritain (10,30-37), le riche insensé (12,16-20), Lazare et le mauvais riche (16,19-31), le pharisien et le publicain (18,9-14). Tucker n'interprète pas ces quatre textes en eux-mêmes ou dans le cadre du troisième évangile. Il préfère étudier à fond l'histoire de l'interprétation moderne de ces paraboles afin de montrer les points faibles de la théorie des *Beispielergählungen*. L'auteur, qui veut arriver à un «just assessment» sur la question (18), conclut que la catégorie «récit exemplaire» est une création de l'exégèse moderne (397): il s'agirait tout simplement, dans le cadre du récit lucanien, de quatre *parabolai* de Jésus. En effet, le terme *parabole* apparaît en Lc 12,16; 16,19 et 18,9 (396, n. 2) et le récit du bon Samaritain commence par la formule *ἄνθρωπός τις*, typique de plusieurs paraboles lucaniennes. La terminologie de l'évangéliste justifie donc difficilement une distinction entre les quatre péripécopes mentionnées et les autres paraboles de Luc. Or, comme le montre bien Tucker, la préoccupation de Jülicher était de démontrer que les paraboles de Jésus ne sont pas des allégories et d'établir une division tranchante entre «parabole» (*Parabel*) et «récit exemplaire». Sur ce point, quelques auteurs (Funk, Crossan, Scott) avaient déjà réagi, par exemple en reconnaissant le caractère métaphorique du récit du bon Samaritain au niveau de la parabole originale de Jésus et en le considérant donc comme une vraie parabole; c'est seulement au niveau du texte composé par Luc que ce récit serait devenu une *Beispielergählung*. Cependant, pour Tucker, la question est plus radicale: c'est la catégorie elle-même de «récit exemplaire» qui doit être remise en question.

Le chapitre 2 de l'étude de Tucker est consacré à la préhistoire du concept *Beispielergählung*. L'auteur montre que, dès avant la première édition de l'ouvrage de Jülicher (1886), quelques exégètes des paraboles avaient déjà rangé les quatre récits précités dans la catégorie de «récits exemplaires». Jülicher, quant à lui, s'est contenté d'ajouter quelques

D'après Tucker, l'étude de la rhétorique ancienne corrobore cette conclusion, même si les auteurs grecs et latins n'ont pas de théorie unifiée. En effet, ces auteurs divergent sur la fonction des paraboles et des récits exemplaires, c'est-à-dire sur les textes littéraires qui véhiculent une comparaison. Cette fonction peut être paradigmatique (Aristote et Quintilien, suivis par Sellin) ou bien stylistique et ornementale. Un texte combine parfois les deux fonctions. Cependant, les auteurs anciens, qu'ils soient grecs ou latins, ne prêtent en aucun cas aux *exempla* ou *paradeigmata* l'intention de proposer une conduite à imiter. Ils n'identifient

pas non plus les caractéristiques formelles spécifiques d'un «récit exemplaire», comme par exemple l'apparition d'éléments divins ou religieux, ou la désignation concrète de personnes ou de groupes. Bref, la rhétorique ancienne ne connaît pas, au contraire de Bultmann et Baasland, le genre littéraire des «récits exemplaires».

Quel est alors le statut des «récits exemplaires»? Ces récits sont-ils de vraies paraboles de Jésus devenues des «exemples de conduite» chez Luc? Quel est le degré de «moral concern» dans les récits exemplaires et dans les autres paraboles de Jésus? Ces questions, formulées par Tucker dans les conclusions de son ouvrage (396-418), touchent un des problèmes les plus débattus de la recherche sur les paraboles et la prédication de Jésus: les rapports entre l'eschatologie et l'éthique (le «moral concern»). J. Jeremias, comme on le sait, oppose Jésus qui annonce le Royaume et la communauté primitive responsable de la moralisation du message. Tucker se demande s'il est possible de séparer les aspects eschatologiques et moraux du message du Royaume. Pour lui, il faut dépasser cette fausse dichotomie et, pour ce faire, il reprend un terme déjà utilisé par d'autres, celui de «fictions utopiques» (407) pour désigner les paraboles de Jésus. Somme toute, il récupère la thèse classique de Dodd-Jeremias-Dupont sur le caractère «interpellant» des paraboles. Tucker souligne en outre le contexte narratif des paraboles, c'est-à-dire leur insertion dans les récits des évangiles synoptiques. En second lieu, il reprend un des thèmes les plus chers de l'école américaine (Wilder, Via, Funk, Crossan, Scott): la parabole comme éclosion d'un monde nouveau et apparition de l'utopie du Royaume. La troisième conclusion de Tucker est sans doute la plus originale de son étude: «all of the parables attributed to Jesus in the synoptic gospels [en y incluant les récits exemplaires] are to be read 'only morally'» (412). Toujours selon Tucker, il ne faudrait jamais oublier que Jésus a fortement critiqué les valeurs et modèles qui prévalaient dans la société de son temps. Tucker reprend ici la ligne de pensée d' H. Koester, «Jesus the Victim», *JBL* 111 (1992) 3-15.

Dans l'ensemble, l'énorme effort de Tucker est loin d'être inutile. Il réussit à montrer les difficultés inhérentes à la division tripartite proposée par Jülicher (*Gleichnis, Parabel, Beispielerzählung*) et reprise par beaucoup par la suite. Il faut donc accepter que les récits exemplaires ne constituent pas un genre littéraire distinct des paraboles. Ce rapprochement entre récits exemplaires et paraboles avait déjà été anticipé par quelques auteurs, comme Sellin qui avait ajouté d'autres cas de récits exemplaires aux quatre récits lucaniens de Jülicher, ou comme Baasland et quelques autres qui remettent en question la singularité des récits exemplaires. Tucker, de son côté, évite soigneusement de se prononcer sur le caractère métaphorique des paraboles de Jésus.

Le style de Tucker est malheureusement pesant et répétitif. Il serait possible de supprimer une centaine de pages! En outre, il aurait été utile d'étudier les textes eux-mêmes, en sus des auteurs. De cette façon, Tucker aurait pu montrer pourquoi et en quoi les quatre textes lucaniens sont de vraies paraboles. Enfin, la logique du discours entraîne parfois l'auteur au-delà de ses prémisses, par exemple quand il affirme avec Aristote et Quintilien: «we are forced to acknowledge that all of the parables of Jesus recorded in the synoptic gospels are examples» (395). Ici, manifestement,

Tucker franchit les limites qu'il avait fixées à sa recherche. Il existe sans doute des points de contact entre la rhétorique classique et l'œuvre littéraire de Luc, mais la chose est bien différente dès qu'il s'agit d'étudier le contexte vital et les préoccupations propres à l'ensemble de paraboles synoptiques et à celles de Jésus lui-même. À propos de la prédication de Jésus dont les paraboles constituent une partie très significative, Tucker propose de maintenir la tension entre l'aspect eschatologique et l'aspect moral (407). L'idée se justifie surtout parce qu'il identifie le «moral concern» avec le caractère interpellant des paraboles. La parabole invite toujours les auditeurs à prendre une décision face au Royaume dévoilé et offert. Mais on peut se demander si cette décision doit porter sur les valeurs présentes dans les paraboles. Est-il certain que toutes les paraboles contiennent une «axiology of values», c'est-à-dire que toutes les paraboles soient des récits exemplaires? Est-ce que la conduite des personnages des quatre récits exemplaires lucaniens est simplement à imiter ou à rejeter?

Le livre de Tucker offre une contribution solide à la discussion actuelle sur la nature des paraboles de Jésus et en particulier sur les *Beispiel Erzählungen* bien qu'il ignore, comme la plupart des exégètes anglo-saxons, la bibliographie en langues latines, comme par exemple le livre de Vittorio Fusco, *Oltre la parabola* (Roma 1983).

Camí de l'Horta 7

E-43470 La Selva del Camp (Catalogne)

Armand PUIG I TÀRRECH

Gunnar ØSTENSTAD, *Patterns of Redemption in the Fourth Gospel. An Experiment in Structural Analysis* (Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity 38). Lewiston, NY, The Edwin Mellen Press, 1998. xxx-370 p. 16,3 x 24,3. \$109.95 – £69.95

Le titre de cet ouvrage indique le double objectif qu'il se propose: découvrir les schémas structurels du Quatrième évangile et étudier leur rapport avec le thème de la rédemption. L'auteur estime avoir découvert la façon de composer de l'évangéliste ainsi que son intention de mettre structurellement en relief une doctrine de la rédemption: «ce que la méthode choisie identifie, ce n'est pas seulement un schéma d'ensemble en sept parties, mais c'est aussi le thème principal de l'évangile» (56). L'ouvrage se distingue donc tout autant d'une simple étude de structure littéraire que d'une simple recherche de contenu théologique. Il se caractérise par l'union étroite des deux perspectives: l'analyse conceptuelle contribue à faire découvrir la structure littéraire et, réciproquement, la structure est mise à contribution pour mener à son terme l'analyse de la doctrine.

Les résultats obtenus sont séduisants. L'auteur propose un grand nombre de schémas bâtis de façon symétrique. L'évangile est divisé en 21 «séquences», dont la longueur varie entre 18 versets (le Prologue: Jn 1,1-18) et 71 versets (Jn 6,1-71). Chacune de ces séquences est disposée selon une symétrie concentrique (avec raison, l'auteur préfère dire «concentrique»

plutôt que «chiastique»). Chaque séquence se compose de 7 «passages», excepté les séquences n^{os} 5, 10 et 15, qui n'en comptent que 5. Les 7 «passages» sont groupés de façon à former un triptyque (par exemple AB – CDC' – B'A').

Le Prologue restant à part, les autres séquences sont distribuées en 7 «sections», qui comprennent respectivement 1 séquence, puis 2, puis 3, puis 5, 5, 3, 1. On a donc pour l'ensemble un septénaire, dont la symétrie, toutefois, n'est pas parfaite, la section centrale n'étant précédée que de 6 séquences, alors qu'elle est suivie de 9 séquences. Un autre groupement, qui, cette fois, comprend le Prologue, présente l'ensemble de l'évangile comme un triptyque: un panneau central, de 3 sections (Jn 5,1–17,26), est précédé d'un panneau latéral (Jn 1,1–4,54: le Prologue et 2 sections) et suivi d'un autre panneau latéral (Jn 18,1–21,25: 2 sections). L'harmonie de cette composition est assurément admirable. A ceux qui la trouveraient trop belle pour être vraie, l'auteur conseille de «consulter les analyses structurelles de textes littéraires de l'antiquité (Virgile, Apollonius de Rhodes), du Moyen Âge et de la Renaissance» (XXV) et il renvoie en particulier aux recherches de M.S. Røstvig, à qui il a demandé de préfacer son ouvrage.

Personnellement, je n'ai aucune objection de principe contre les compositions concentriques. Elles correspondent à une tradition littéraire très bien attestée dans la Bible. Dans le cas présent, cependant, je dois avouer ma perplexité, surtout parce que l'auteur exprime ses conclusions sans en avoir donné une démonstration méthodique. Ses considérations sur la structure et la doctrine du Quatrième évangile, qui commencent page 83, parlent tout de suite des sections 1 et 2, sans avoir expliqué comment on peut découvrir leur existence et fixer leurs limites. Le lecteur est supposé admettre les positions de l'auteur comme allant de soi.

D'autre part, la place donnée au concentrisme semble excessive. Pour obtenir des dispositions concentriques, l'auteur n'hésite pas, parfois, à briser des unités littéraires évidentes. C'est ainsi que les phrases de Jn 1,35-37: «Le lendemain, Jean était là de nouveau...», qui marquent le début d'un nouvel épisode (1,35-51), sont séparées de cet épisode et présentées comme la conclusion de l'épisode précédent (1,29-34), de façon à se trouver en correspondance concentrique avec Jn 1,29: «Le lendemain, il voit Jésus...» (292). En réalité, il s'agit là d'un cas de parallélisme entre deux débuts et non d'une inclusion entre le début et la fin d'une même unité littéraire. Inversement, l'auteur soude parfois entre elles des unités littéraires nettement distinctes. La phrase de Jn 1,51 qui conclut la péricope 1,35-51 par la prédiction d'une vision future («Vous verrez le ciel ouvert...») est considérée, non pas comme une phrase finale, mais comme l'élément central d'une séquence qui s'étend jusqu'à la fin du ch. 2. Dans l'optique de l'auteur, cette phrase *doit* être centrale, parce qu'elle est très importante. Mais c'est là un principe contestable: il est, en effet, fort naturel qu'une phrase de conclusion ait une importance toute particulière.

L'auteur déclare: «Le critère majeur d'une composition concentrique est que le texte-pivot porte l'insistance principale et serve en même temps à unifier toute la composition. La validité de ma théorie dépend donc du rôle joué par le texte situé au centre — SÉQUENCE 10» (35). La séquence 10

comprend les 42 versets du ch. 10. Précédée de 9 séquences et suivie de 11, elle n'est pas centrale numériquement, mais elle l'est en tant que 3^e séquence de la section centrale, qui en comporte 5. On peut donc admettre qu'elle est centrale dans une structure générale imparfaitement concentrique et lui reconnaître une importance très grande. Elle contient effectivement des affirmations capitales sur la mission de Jésus et sur son union avec le Père. Mais le principe affirmé par l'auteur ne s'y vérifie pas, car, au centre de cette séquence centrale, que met-il? Une question posée par les adversaires de Jésus pour contester son autorité; après avoir déclaré que Jésus «a un démon et déraisonne», ils demandent: «Pourquoi l'écoutez-vous?» (10,20c). Est-il possible de voir dans ces quatre mots le message le plus important de tout l'évangile? Assurément non. Après les avoir cités, l'auteur se tire de la difficulté en parlant de la réponse que le contexte postérieur apporte. Ce contexte (10,25-30) révèle «qui est réellement Jésus et quel est le but de son ministère» (129), thèmes de la plus haute importance. Mais ils se trouvent dans un autre épisode et non pas au centre du passage (10,19-21).

Une autre difficulté vient de la façon dont l'auteur, pour établir un rapport structurel, passe souvent d'un concept à un autre. C'est ainsi que, dans son analyse du Prologue, il affirme que les passages B (1,6-8), D (1,12) et B' (1,15) «soulignent des aspects sotériologiques» plutôt que des aspects de révélation (87). En réalité, aucun de ces passages ne parle de salut; B et B', en particulier, insistent sur le témoignage de Jean Baptiste, ce qui est en rapport direct avec le thème de la révélation. Pour justifier son affirmation, l'auteur déclare alors que B-B' ont en commun une insistance «sur la façon dont le Baptiste sert le dessein de Dieu (qui est *de sauver*)» (87), mais c'est là introduire de force le thème du salut dans des textes qui ne l'expriment pas. Cette manière de procéder permet de trouver partout des correspondances, même entre des textes très hétérogènes. Tel est le cas des passages 2 B (1,29-37) et 2 B' (2,13-22), au sujet desquels l'auteur reconnaît que «des liens formels entre 2B-B' sont difficiles à trouver et sont peut-être inexistants», mais il ajoute aussitôt que «l'analyse exégétique, cependant, révèle que, tandis que 2 B définit l'*identité* de Jésus et son *ministère*, 2B' anticipe l'*accomplissement de ce ministère...*» (93). Un lien conceptuel est ainsi établi, mais on peut douter de sa validité pour fonder une structure du texte.

Cela dit, l'ouvrage contient une multitude d'observations intéressantes et suggestives. Contre R. Bultmann, l'auteur met bien en valeur les textes du Quatrième évangile qui expriment la valeur rédemptrice du mystère pascal de Jésus. Il montre bien, également, l'importance du thème du nouveau Temple et de la nouvelle relation avec Dieu. Il apporte une riche contribution à l'étude de la théologie johannique.

Pontificio Istituto Biblico
Via della Pilotta, 25
I-00187 Roma

Albert VANHOYE

Thomas R. SCHREINER, *Romans* (Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament 6). Grand Rapids, MI, Baker Books, 1998. xxii-919 p. 15,8 x 23,4. \$39.99

S. has added a valuable Romans commentary to the significant number we already possess. It is extremely important that this positive state of affairs should be continued, not only because this is such an important letter, but also since it is so full of exegetical 'quagmires'. The only way to make headway is to continue research and discussion, and to make the results of these endeavours available to the scholarly community.

Bearing in mind particularly laypersons and busy pastors the author set out to present a commentary fulfilling Calvin's requirements of brevity and lucidity. He was more successful regarding the latter. As to the first, he wanted to avoid the excessive length of, for instance, the two- and three-volume works we have become accustomed to, but, in the end, the 900 pages of this one volume do not require substantially less reading. The question is whether, in the case of Romans, the qualities of brevity and 'meatiness' (cf. xii) can really be combined.

I found this commentary very reader-friendly. This is not only due to its clarity, but also to its formal set-up. The summary of each section's flow of thought and structuring of the text is slightly shaded in, which decidedly helps to distinguish it from the main section entitled "Exegesis and Exposition". Some additional notes, consisting mainly of text-critical remarks, conclude the presentation. (Methodologically it would have been preferable to have the translation and text-criticism of each passage preceding the rest.) Footnotes (instead of endnotes) also substantially facilitate reading. Another most helpful feature is the indication of the position of each specific passage within the macro-structure and the micro-structure on the top-left and the top-right of each page respectively. Another *desideratum* would have been fulfilled if the verse numbers were printed in bold. Every reader of e.g. Käsemann's majestic commentary (*An die Römer* [HNT 8A; Tübingen 1973]) knows what a struggle it takes to locate the exposition of a specific verse.

In his preface the author announces that he views the glory of God as the 'central theme [...] that permeates the letter' (xiii; see also 815). However, a glance at his outline of the structure of Romans (25) indicates that the 'righteousness of God' appears in the caption of each of the eight sections into which he has divided this book, even in those where there is no reference to δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ (cf. sections VI, VII and VIII). It would have been less confusing if he had distinguished clearly between the theme (the righteousness of God), the immediate purpose(s) and the ultimate purpose or theme (the glorification of God).

The balanced nature of this commentary is already apparent in the introduction to Romans. Instead of opting for an either-or between Paul's intent to resolve the tension between Jewish and Gentile Christians and his attempt to draw the Roman church into his missionary agenda, S. chooses for a combination of these. In my view he could even have broadened Paul's reasons for writing Romans, since we most probably have to reckon with a convergence of several authorial considerations. Although generally

taking a conservative approach (he accepts for instance all thirteen letters as authentic), different viewpoints are presented fairly and the author's motivates his own positions well. He has a knack cutting down different arguments to their essentials, presenting the reader with concise and up-to-date information about important recent publications and positions.

Simply following the trajectory of Romans itself, Schreiner's views on some typical exegetical and a few text-critical problems will be presented and, where applicable, provided with some remarks. It will also become clear that, if our 'first task is simply to see what the text actually says' (2), this is easier said than done.

The christological confession in 1,3-4 is a natural place to start. The most interesting aspect of S.'s discussion of this enigmatic statement is his interpretation of the *κατὰ σάρκα –κατὰ πνεῦμα ἀγιωσύνης* parallel as referring to two ages: the first as a reference to the existence of Jesus in the old age of the flesh, that is before his resurrection; the second as envisaging his existence in the new age of the Spirit. Interesting and original as it is, I cannot say that this interpretation convinced me. It still seems more acceptable that the two elements of this parallel structure should be understood anthropologically, rather than in terms of salvation history. I also found it somewhat confusing that the author entitled the whole of Rom 1,1-7 as 'Salutation', since this is in fact a technical term normally reserved for the greeting (1,7).

Schreiner's discussion of *δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ* in 1,17 is very clear and illuminating. He refrains from a choice between what he calls the 'forensic' and the 'transformative' views and interprets the latter as a transformation of the lives of believers by the Holy Spirit (65). The question is whether this is not an overburdening of the forensic setting of the metaphor. It might be better to restrict the transformation implied to that of a sinner whose status is effectively changed to that of a *δικαίος* before God. This should definitely not be understood in terms of a denial of the transforming work of the Spirit in believers. The only question is whether the latter should be understood as part and parcel of the righteousness of God metaphor. It is surprising that S. (see 59) follows Paul Achtemeier (*Romans* [Atlanta 1985] 35-36) in understanding vv. 16-17 as grammatically subordinate to v. 15. Certainly γάρ cannot serve as an argument, since its coordinate use to motivate and/or emphasise is a typically Pauline feature, as can be amply illustrated in 1,9.11.18.19.20.26; 2,1.11.12.13.14, etc. Equally surprising is the author's description of the genitives in both *δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ* and *ὁργὴ θεοῦ* (v.18) as genitives of *origin*, since in both instances a divine activity is envisaged (see: 65).

A much discussed passage is Paul's reference to homosexual behaviour in 1,26-27. S. concludes that Paul condemns all homosexual relations and that this judgement should unreservedly be understood as authoritative also for today (94-97). The many problems surrounding such a straightforward conclusion are not discussed.

A first reading of Rom 2,7.10 gives the impression that Paul reckons with the possibility of salvation through good works. S. certainly does not take the problem lightly. His solution that Paul is referring to Christians who keep the law by the power of the Spirit, confuses the issue. At this

stage Paul's argument deals with the pre-Christian position of Jews and Greeks (cf. v.10). Also, the author's statement that Paul teaches the necessity of good works for entering the kingdom (cf. also 115) should, in my view, be formulated more guardedly.

Many exegetical headaches have been caused by the question whether the qualifying genitive in πίστεως Ἰησοῦ (Χριστοῦ) (3,22.26) is subjective or objective (the faithfulness of Jesus Christ vs. faith in Jesus Christ). S. presents a balanced and fair discussion of both views. In my opinion his extensive argumentation for the second position is entirely convincing.

Contrary to commentaries like those of J.D.G. Dunn (*Romans 1-8* [WBC 38a; Dallas, TX 1988] viii, 242-244) and U. Wilckens (*Der Brief an die Römer* [EKK VI/1; Neukirchen 1978] I, 181-182, 286-288) which place a major break after Rom 5, S. puts the break after chapter 4, bundling chapters 5-8 together as a discrete major section. I must fully agree with him. He bases his decision on a thematic argument, which is certainly acceptable, but mistakenly overlooks the important linguistic features which could have undergirded his position.

I found Schreiner's exposition of the identity of the ἐγώ in 7,7-25, which Wilckens (*Römer*, 97) regards as the most difficult passage in the whole of Romans, excellent. His conclusion is that the ἐγώ primarily refers to Paul; but it is used paradigmatically. To make a choice between pre-Christian and Christian experience is unwarranted. The focus of the passage falls on the inability of the law to transform human beings. Only the Spirit can work that transformation (Rom 8). Although S. does not mention Michel's name here, his position regarding the focus of 7,7-25 agrees substantially with that taken already by Michel.

The reference of πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ in Rom 11,26 is another *crux exegetica*. S. concludes, first, that it refers to a great future ingathering of Jews into the people of God and, secondly, — against modern sensibilities — that Paul does not contemplate a *Sonderweg* for the salvation of Jews, apart from faith in Christ. Within the context of the argument in 11,25-31 this certainly seems to be Paul's conviction.

Rom 15,7-13, highlighting the themes of the glorification of God and Christian hope, can certainly be viewed as the climax of Romans (see A.B. du Toit, "Die Kirche als doxologische Gemeinschaft im Römerbrief", *Neot* 27 [1993] 69-77). S. has correctly seen this (752-762). One of the major contributions of his commentary is its theological awareness and especially its focus on the importance of the glorification of God in Romans. Within the structure and argument of Romans, the former should undoubtedly be understood as the ultimate purpose of Paul's gospel. Unfortunately S. did not always resist the temptation to read this theologically extremely important motif into texts where it may have been present in the substructure of the author's mind, but definitely not on the surface level of the text. This certainly seems to be the case in S.'s discussion of Rom 1,16-17. His valuable insights into the importance of the name of God and its glorification would have been more apposite elsewhere.

As is well-known, Rom 16 confronts us with some major text-critical problems. S. concurs with the majority position that chapter 16 forms part of Paul's original Romans letter. In addition he accepts also the authenticity

of 16,25-27, regarding 1,1-7 and 16,25-27 as an *inclusio*. It should be conceded that the inclusion of vv. 25-27 certainly provides an impressive and fitting conclusion to Romans. It would also fit in neatly with S.'s accentuation of the glorification theme. At the same time the author has, in my opinion, underestimated the problems regarding the acceptance of the Pauline origin of these verses.

The work concludes with an almost 50-page list of works cited, an index of authors, an index of Greek words, an index of Scripture and other ancient writings — a feature once again illustrating its informational value and reader-friendliness.

To conclude: S. has provided us with a useful, informative commentary. Its most positive features are its reader-friendliness, orientational value, sound judgements and theological awareness. This makes this commentary very valuable to those, especially ministers, who need a lucid, representative orientation, a sound evaluation of positions and useful material for contemplation and preaching. Lay Christians may find it at stretches too long-winded. Specialists will deplore some deficiencies in grammatical refinement and stylistic and rhetorical insight.

University of Pretoria
Pretoria, South Africa

Andrie DU TOIT

Gregory K. BEALE, *The Book of Revelation. A Commentary on the Greek Text* (The New International Greek Testament Commentary). Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge, UK, Eerdmans – Carlisle, UK, The Paternoster Press, 1999. lxiv-1245 p. 16,2 x 24,4. \$75.00

G.K. Beale, Professor of NT at the Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary (South Hamilton, MA), has been writing on Rev for 20 years, producing about 25 contributions, and now this commentary, which cost him eight years of intense work. Beale declares in the preface how the commentary arose out of his previous studies on the use of OT in Rev, and that he sets himself four goals: (i-ii) study the OT allusions and Jewish exegetical tradition in a more trenchant manner than has previously been done, (iii) trace more precisely the exegetical argument in Rev, and (iv) interact with the secondary literature published since the commentaries by Swete and Charles (see xix).

As far as the situation of the Asian Churches and the date of composition are concerned, Beale does not exclude the Neronian setting, but prefers that of Domitian, Rev having been written in a time of imperial cult and of some persecution, since in fact Nero did not harm Christians outside of Rome, whereas spasmodic persecution and increasing emperor-worship are documented in literary and numismatic sources under Domitian. In particular, the letters of Rev 2-3 reflect a spiritual deterioration that probably would have taken a significant period of time

to develop and may be more appropriate to the second Christian generation. Beale then discusses author, literary genre, symbolism, interpretative approaches, manuscripts and text, peculiarities of Greek grammar and the theology of Rev. But what deserves particular attention in Beale's introduction is the treatise about OT allusions in Rev, and structure.

Beale's familiarity with the OT-Rev relationship enables him to gain the following insights, in addition to the many and enlightening pages on OT allusions and Jewish background in the commentary: OT allusions amount to five hundred (an average based on 8 calculations: 180 at the very least, according to Dittmar, and 1,000 at the most according to van der Waal); none of them is introduced by a quotation formula; most are taken from theophanic scenes, three of which speak of heavenly books; it is difficult to know whether John depends on the Hebrew Text (according to Charles) or the LXX (according to Swete); sometimes four, five or more different OT references merge into one picture (77); Dan is the 'hermeneutical magnet' of all other quotations (367), yielding the most, i.e. about two thirds of all the allusions (729), and its influence may even extend to the structure of the whole Apocalypse (87). Moreover, John may quote OT unconsciously in the less clear or non-clustered allusions. In this case, non-contextual use of the OT can be expected, but the usual respect for the OT context, although in varying degrees and with changes of application, can be verified (85). At the same time, however, John is so creative that the pictures undergo any number of changes: expansions, condensations, supplemental imagery etc. and, in the end, turn out to be creative and original compositions (89). John's perspective hints at the unified design of salvation from one Testament to the other, and at the eschatological fulfilment in the NT. Beale finally and interestingly connects John's OT allusions with the solecisms of Ap (cf. the list of the 27 more fully discussed, on p. 101), which are according to him intentional and, 'sticking out like a sore thumb' (101) through their grammatical and syntactical dissonance, cause the reader to pause and recognise OT quotations, show him the solidarity of John's writing with that of the OT, and say how OT revelation is penetrating the pagan world uncompromisingly (103).

However, Beale probably exaggerates in affirming that the OT is the key to understanding the whole book (xix) and by settling many debatable points on the basis of the OT text which John alludes to: this is so for the meaning of the βιβλίον (5,1) whose central idea should be that of judgement, because of Ezek 2, Isa 29, Dan 7, and Dan 12 (369). It applies also to the four horsemen (6,1-8), who 'must' all be of the same negative nature 'since Zech 1 and 6 are an influential model in the author's mind' (376), and again regarding the bowls which 'must be understood as punishments' more than as warnings, because they are reminiscent of the plagues of Exod (148, 811), notwithstanding the double μετανοεῖν of 16,9.11.

As for the structure, Beale's choice is wavering and contradictory. He starts for example by saying: 'The most plausible outline divides the book into either seven or eight sections ... Possibly, John intends that both outlines be discerned' (114). Beale's reasons for both structures are either based on grounds of vague convenience or are external to Rev: 'The sevenfold division could be favoured by John's preference for that number ... On the other

hand, the number eight is an essential feature of the number of Jesus and of new creation (the sum of the letters of "Jesus" in Greek add up to 888) ... Christ died on the sixth day of the week, rested in the tomb on the Sabbath, and rose from the dead on the eighth day' (114-115). As for the proposals based on the number seven, Beale approves A. Farrer ('Among these, Farrer's outline is most cogent', 112), A. Yarbro Collins ('Collins's proposal is correct', 113), and Wendland ('One of the most interesting, striking and consistent attempts to divide the book into multiple groups of 'seven' is by E.R. Wendland', 115). Then Beale proposes his sevenfold favourite structure, but it is based on chiasmus: 'A chiastic structure can also possibly be discerned in Rev., which would point further to a framework of synchronously and thematically parallel segments' (130-131). As to the proposals based on chiasmus, Beale then approves that of Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza ('Another plausible sevenfold chiastic structure has been proposed by Fiorenza', 130), then that of a student ('The following chart is closest to the structural view of [M.G.] Kline, as configured by one of my students' [135, n. 104]), as well as that of Barbara W. Snyder ('She also presents the most viable chiastic outline of the book so far attempted', 143). It should be added that Beale takes two more structural criteria from Dan: (i) 'John is employing the same allusion [= to ὁ δεῖ γενέσθαι, as to an allusion to Dan 2,28-29] to give structure to his whole book' (140, and 87, 115); (ii) 'The five apocalyptic visions in Daniel (chs. 2, 7, 8, 9, 10-12) ... may be the prototypical structure followed by Rev' (87, and 135), and adds the principle of the four raptures in the Spirit, following Mazzaferri (115). Finally, Beale opens up towards every other possible outline, almost to infinity: 'Likewise, other plausible subdivisions ... may not be mutually exclusive of the fourfold, sevenfold, and eightfold outlines' (115). When Beale subsequently sketches an interpretative summary of the book (145-150), and when he develops his commentary, he follows still other subdivisions, forgetting that his chiasmus situates Rev 11,19-14,20 in the centre of the book, while repeatedly stating that Rev's climax is in the final *katàbasis* of the eschatological Jerusalem, as is obvious and unquestionable.

Beale's commentary is inspired, then, by the principle of eclecticism (cf. the headline on p. 48) and 'inclusivism' rather than by that of non-contradiction, as is perceivable in many expressions like: 'dual role', 'multifaceted', 'not mutually exclusive', 'not inconsistent with', etc. This is why the first rider can be a summary statement explained in more detail by the following three (378-379) and, simultaneously, the fourth rider as well is a summary of the previous three (376) and epitomises them (383, 385). Furthermore, the four riders can be both agents of Christ and of Satan. On the one hand, they are brought about by Christ: 'The command for each of the four destructive horses and riders originates from the throne room, where Christ opens each seal' (370). But, on the other hand, the first rider represents 'a satanic force attempting to defeat and oppress believers spiritually through deception, persecution, or both', and may even include 'reference to the antichrist, to governments that persecute Christians, to the devil's servants in general', and 'is intended by John as a parody of Christ's righteousness and victory... worthy only for ridicule' (377). The same is to be said of the multiple identification of Babylon: Babylon is not merely

Roman society and the emperor cult but also the culture of Asia Minor and similar places; in addition, it is the entire corrupt economic-religious system and not merely the apostate church, and is also the apostate Israel of the first and following centuries (885).

Rev's problematical chronology is solved in Beale's commentary by means of many devices in connection with a '... crucial hermeneutical principle that needs to be kept in mind etc.' (129). The principle runs as follows: 'The primary intention ... is to represent the order of John's visions, not necessarily the order of historical facts, which would have to be only secondary'. On this basis Beale states for example that the four winds of 7,1-3 are chronologically antecedent to the four riders of 6,1-8 (406-407, 408), and at every occurrence of *μετὰ ταῦτα*, *μετὰ τοῦτο*, or *ἔσχατος* (in the expression 'the last plagues'), etc. Beale reminds his readers that these expressions do not entail chronological succession in the events, but only in John's visions (316-317, 406, 426 etc.; 786, 810). Another 'chronological' expedient is the reversal of order in the appearing and disappearing of the Dragon, the first and second beasts, since it 'points ... to a lack of concern for chronological sequence' (148, 812). Finally, the non-chronological *καί* would be another means in the hands of John, which can even solve the great difficulty of the millennium: '... *καί* throughout the whole Apocalypse can indicate either historical sequence or visionary sequence. More often than not it indicates visionary sequence... Only three of the thirty-five uses of the conjunction in those verses clearly indicate sequence in historical time. The remaining uses of *καί* serve only as visionary linking devices' (975).

All this, however, is too much and too easy to be true. It is far better to look for synchronisms between Rev's episodes and stories in the text, as did J. Mede, the first to attempt systematically such a synchronising in his 'Clavis Apocalyptica' (Cambridge 1627). For example, Beale rightly poses the question whether or not 9,4 (the locusts must not harm the grass of the earth etc., but only 'those who do not have the seal of God on their foreheads') comes chronologically after the sealing of the 144.000 (120, n. 62), or whether the heathen's trampling over the holy city (11,2), the prophetic commission of the two witnesses (11,3), the sojourn of the Woman in the desert (12,6.14), and the blasphemous activity of the Beast (13,5) are to be considered synchronical or not, since all of them last an equivalent time (1.260 days, 42 months, or three and a half years).

Finally, as to Beale's very rich bibliographical documentation, one notices that *Revue Biblique*, *Biblische Zeitschrift*, and *Biblica* are missing in the list of abbreviations of titles of periodicals, and that relevant but non-English (or not translated into English) commentaries are quoted only five times (Bousset), only once (Allo), or never (Zahn, Schlatter, Loisy, Bonsirven, Müller), notwithstanding the series' title of the Commentary: *New International Critical Commentary*. One learns from Beale's commentary that, according to A.D. Callahan, the idiosyncratic grammar of Rev would express a protest against the then dominant Greek language (101, n. 7). One would hope that a similar dominance will not be repeated with English today.

Varia

Bezalel PORTEN – Ada YARDENI (eds.), *Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt*. Newly Copied, Edited and Translated into English. 4: Ostraca and Assorted Inscriptions (Texts and Studies for Students). Jerusalem, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem – Department of the History of the Jewish People, 1999. lxxiv-304 p. 9 foldouts. 24 x 34. \$80.00

This is the last of the four-volume textbook of Aramaic documents from Egypt. While each of the first three volumes has about forty to fifty texts of one genre (vol. 1 letters; vol. 2 contracts; vol. 3 literary texts; see my review article of vol. 3 in *Bib* 76 [1995] 85-92), the present volume contains no less than 478 texts, including papyrus and parchment fragments; ostraca (mostly letters); jar handle inscriptions; stone, wood, and metal incisions; funerary inscriptions; graffiti; the Sheikh Fadl cave inscription; dubiosa. There are 3 figures; a map showing the provenance of the inscriptions; a glossary, a list of Proper Names; concordances with other editions and bibliography. This volume also includes about a hundred hitherto unpublished papyrus fragments from the Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, the Allard Pierson Museum, and the Egyptian Museum of Cairo. The publication of these fragments together with the handcopies by Ada Yardeni is a significant contribution to Aramaic papyrology and palaeography.

As in the previous volumes, Porten and Yardeni have collated most of the texts. The apparatus appended to each text gives details where they differ from the *editio princeps*. Other works like Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri* (1923); Grelot, *Documents araméens d'Égypte* (1972); Donner-Röllig, *KAI* (1968); Gibson, *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions*, vol. 2 (1975); Koopmans, *Aramäische Chrestomathie* (1962) are still useful for their philological notes (which are not given in the present work). On the other hand, the excellent copies can sometimes replace long discussions. These copies were actually made on the basis of photographs, which is the normal practice. Consequently, inscriptions written on a circular surface will necessarily look somewhat distorted in the tracing based on photographs. Such is the case with three of the four Brooklyn silver bowl inscriptions from Tell Maskhuta D 15.2-4 (pp. 232-233). The handcopies of three of these inscriptions are clearly the result of composite tracing of different photographs taken from different sides with the unavoidable mixing of perspectives. For round surfaces, the best method is to copy directly from the original or from a cast. But this may not always be possible.

The following comments deal with the more familiar inscriptions. In all these cases, Porten and Yardeni have considerably improved the readings adopted by the *editio princeps* and subsequent works, including the widely used *KAI* and a recent practical text collection by J. Lindenberger, *Ancient Aramaic and Hebrew Letters* (SBL Writings from the Ancient World 4; Atlanta 1994). References to these works are added here to help the general reader of this review.

The translation of lines 3-5 of the instruction to shear a sheep D. 7.8 (160; cf. Lindenberger, 15) is not entirely satisfactory. The text reads as follows ⁽³⁾ ...*lmgz* ⁽⁴⁾ *'mr* *zylh qdm* ⁽⁵⁾ *mtmrṭ bkb* and is translated as '...to shear. The wool of hers already is being torn on the thorn(s)'. Thus *'mr zylh* are considered as 'he subject of lines 4-6. This interpretation has the disadvantage of having to explain the unusual position of the adverbial noun *qdm* 'earlier' between the alleged subject and the predicate *mtmrṭ* 'is being torn off'. The normal position of adverbs like this is at the beginning of a clause. The difficulty disappears once ⁽⁴⁾ *'mr* *zylh* is parsed as complement to the previous word in line 3 *l-mgz* 'to shear'. Therefore lines 3-5 can be rendered as '...to shear its wool. Earlier it (= the wool) is being torn on the thorn(s)'.

Line 3 of the barter transaction letter D 7.16 (p. 168-169; cf. Lindenberger, 22) ⁽¹⁾ *lmh hn y'bd hylyhh hn l' npšk[y]* is translated as 'Lest, if they get lost, by the life of Yhh, if not (= surely) your life!' A more appropriate rendering would be 'Why! If it (i.e., the shipment) gets spoilt, by the life of YHH, you will have only yourself to blame!' Then instead of *'l[?]* at the end of line 7 one may restore *'l[yh]*, i.e., prep. *'l* + 3sg. f. 'over this'. There is room enough for these two letters. This will give the following alternative translation: ⁽⁶⁾ ...*k'nt* ⁽⁷⁾ *hy lyhh hn l' 'l[yh]* ⁽⁸⁾ *npšky* as 'Now, by the life of YHH, for this you will have only yourself to blame!' rather than 'Now, by the life of YHH, if not, on your life'. The threat merely reiterates line 3 above. Note that in both lines 3 and 8, *npšky* means simply 'yourself', used of a woman. It is unlikely that *hn l'* in line 7 means simply 'if not', that is, if the instruction to send barley in exchange given in line 5 is not fulfilled. In that case its position would be after 'by the life of YHH' rather than before it as in the text.

Generally the new readings of the unique dream ostrakon D. 7.17 (p. 169; cf. Lindenberger, 12; KAI 270) have improved the understanding of this interesting text. Note, however, that Porten and Yardeni read the first word in line 5 as *thzh* or *thzy* and translated as 'May she regard'. As a matter of fact, the handcopy shows the rest of a *yodh* rather than a *he*. Again, the 3sg. jussive of verbs III-weak normally ends in *yodh* rather than *he* (which would indicate the imperfect). The word in line 7 is read as *šlmy* and translated as 'my welfare'. Actually the badly preserved first letter could also be a *het* instead of *šin*, giving *hlmy* 'my dream'. Thus lines 5-7 will read as ⁽⁵⁾ *thzy yh* ⁽⁶⁾ *mlyh* ⁽⁷⁾ *hlmy* 'May Yahmoliah (a woman's name) see my dream', meaning, 'If only Yahmoliah can see my dream'. The meaning of *qtyn* in line 13 has something to do with 'being meagre' rather than 'cucumber', which is not clearly documented. Therefore the rendering of ⁽¹¹⁾ *hl' l'* ⁽¹²⁾ *š'r* ⁽¹³⁾ *qtyn* should be 'Look, there does not remain even a meagre supply'.

The last sentence of the instruction to collect the dues of a cultic association D 7.29 (p. 177; cf. Lindenberger, 13) ⁽⁷⁾ ...*dbṛ* ⁽⁸⁾ *'lwhy* ⁽⁹⁾ *wyntnhy* ⁽¹⁰⁾ *lkm* can hardly be translated as 'Get to him that he may give it to you' since the verb *dbṛ* is a transitive verb meaning 'to take' or 'to lead away', here 'to collect'. The expression *'lwhy* 'over him' here refers to the *ksp* 'silver', that is, the money to be paid as dues of the *marzeah* association mentioned in lines 2-4. Hence a better rendering of lines 7-10 would be 'Collect his dues, and he should give it to you'.

The word *wld*³ in line 1 of the letter concerning wool and castor oil D 7.33 (p. 179) is more likely a personal name Walda or something like that rather than 'the child'. The usual word for child is *ynq* or '*lym*'. It is true that *wld* in the sense of 'child' is found in several Nabatean and Palmyrean documents, obviously an Arabism. But its occurrence here is unlikely. So a more appropriate translation of (1) ...*k'nt wld*³ 'l (2) *lk tml*... would be 'Now, Walda has gone to you yesterday...'.⁴

Perhaps the following alternative reading of the offering table inscription D 20.1 (p. 252; cf. *KAI* 268) can be considered: (1) *htpy lqrbt bnt l'ws* (2) *ry hpy 'bd 'bytb br* (3) *bnt >x< hy 'bd qdm 'ws* (4) *>h<ry hpy* (1) 'Offering table as an offering of Banit to Osi (2) ris-Ḥapi which Abitab son of (3) Banit has made. This he made before Osi (4) *>h<ris-Ḥapi*'. Porten and Yardeni read (1) *htpy lqrbt bnt l'ws* (2) *ry hpy 'bd 'bytb br* (3) *bnt lh y'bd qdm 'ws* (4) *>h<ry hpy* (1) 'Offering table as an offering of Banit to Osi (2) ris-Ḥapi (Serapis) (which) Abitab son of (3) Banit made for him so that he (Banit) may be (or: he [Ahitab] will make [offerings]) before Osi (4) *>h<ris-Ḥapi*'. I read *>x<* instead of their *lamedh* and the resulting *hy* now functions as fronted object of '*bd* 'he has made'. The sign cannot be a *lamedh* unless one is prepared to accept that its leg runs leftward, thus a mirror image of its normal form. This leftward stroke also eliminates the reading of *CIS* II/1 123 as *kaph* adopted in *KAI* and several other studies. Hence it is best to consider the sign as an insignificant error of engraving as is obviously the case with the anticipated *het* at the beginning of line 4.

Line 2 of the Carpentras funerary stele D 20.5 (p. 254; cf. *KAI* 269) ...*wkršy ʔš l 'mrt tmt* should be translated 'And a single slander she did not say at all' rather than 'and the slander of a man she did not say at all'. As a matter of fact, the usage of ʔš as an indefinite pronoun 'any' is well documented in Elephantine Aramaic.

With the completion of this last volume of the textbook, Porten and Yardeni have set a new standard in Aramaic studies. Their work is itself a monument.

Pontificio Istituto Biblico
Via della Pilotta, 25
I-00187 Roma

Agustinus GIANITO

David J.A. CLINES, *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*. Volume 4. *Yodh-Lamedh*. Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1998. 642 p. 19,5 x 25,3. £100 – \$150,00

The publication of the volume under review means that the Dictionary has now reached the half-way mark. It is a longer volume than any of its predecessors and in fact is expected to be the longest of all the volumes of the Dictionary. The principal reason for this length is the number of very frequently occurring words that are treated. There are fourteen words occurring more than 1000 times. So for example 'Israel' is found 2512

times in the Masoretic Text, with Ben Sira, Qumran and inscriptions raising the total to 2909 times. This entry runs to ten pages. More common still is the divine name YHWH which appears 6828 times in the MT and altogether some 7107 times, and still every occurrence in 'Classical Hebrew' is cited and analysed. This entry then runs to 28 pages. Only the most common words or particles are not treated exhaustively: כּ 'like', כּי 'for', ל 'to' and לא 'not'. A factor which is contributing significantly to increasing the size of the whole Dictionary is the growing number of published texts from Qumran. This volume, as did previous ones, lists the sources from Qumran and related texts. The second list of Dead Sea Scrolls published in volume 1 (45-51), which correlates the sigla used in DCH with numbers assigned to documents, will be replaced in the final volume.

A number of not insignificant changes have been made to the Dictionary since the publication of volume I. Names of persons and places are now given the same analysis as other nouns. Words that have been proposed by scholars but not necessarily widely accepted have been introduced into the Dictionary. Such words are indicated by an asterisk. As Clines points out in the introduction to volume 2, the decision to include such proposals shows that there is more uncertainty than scholars had perhaps previously thought. On the other hand it does reflect the situation in the scholarly literature. At the same time there is no need to exaggerate the uncertainty since these proposals are in fact limited to a comparatively small number of texts. Another change from volume 1 is the introduction of a bibliography which not only gives references for these proposals but also contains citations of studies on the semantics of individual Hebrew words. With regard to the Qumran texts, from volume 2 the Dictionary no longer uses the Academy of the Hebrew language edition as the base text. Citations are made either from the editio princeps or from another scholarly edition. At the same time DCH lists beside each Qumran text the page numbers of the translation by F. García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated*. The Qumran texts in English (tr. W.G.E. Watson; Leiden 1994). A small but useful improvement is the numbering of words in the table listing the order of their frequency. These changes contribute to making the Dictionary even more useful.

DCH shows for every verb, the nouns that are its subjects and objects, and for every noun, the verbs of which it is the subject or object. Nevertheless, users of DCH may not be clear about the principle according to which the sections listing subjects and objects are organised. The Introduction points out that the principle of organisation is in fact that of association. Thus in articles on nouns, verbs for being come first, then verbs for movement, then verbs for speaking and so on. In articles on verbs the subjects are commonly arranged with words for persons at the beginning, then words for things, and words for abstracts at the end. The entry on the divine name contains an outline of the structure of the article at the beginning, which can be helpful as an example of how in articles on nouns, verbs which have the noun as their subject (or object) are listed. At the same time the Introduction warns that there will inevitably be differences in the treatment of nouns and that the authors of each article

have been free to choose what seems to them a logical sequence. While an alphabetical sequence of verbs might present an obvious attraction, the arrangement chosen makes good sense.

The individual entries are endowed with the high standard of accuracy one has come to expect of DCH. In an endeavour of this kind there is obviously room for discussion of particular points. One of the most frequently occurring words in the MT of the Old Testament is כָּל, 'all' (more than 5000 times). DCH gives several different nuances for this term but does not mention 'both' which is most suitable in a few passages where the reference is to only two. An example is Isa 31,3b where the word is usually either translated, 'all' or simply omitted. W.H. Irwin renders, 'Yahweh extends his hand, and he who aids will slip and he who is aided will fall and together both (כֻּלָּם) will perish' (W.H. Irwin, *Isaiah* 28-33. Translation with Philological Notes [BibOr 30; Rome 1977] 112). Another instance is Jer 34,7 (where the LXX lacks an equivalent). Here again the reference is explicitly to two, 'they are fighting against Jerusalem and against both (כֻּלָּם) of the cities of Judah that remain, against Lachish and against Azekah'.

Volume 4 is a further substantial addition to the Dictionary not only in length and sheer quantity of material but also in the quality of the articles. The user will perhaps be surprised but surely pleased to read that every reference cited in the Dictionary has been looked up by hand in its source (8). Noteworthy too with this dictionary is that volume 4 appears only two years after volume 3 (and five years after volume 1). The editor and his team of collaborators may be congratulated on their outstanding work.

Pontificio Istituto Biblico
Via della Pilotta, 25
I-00187 Roma

Robert ALTHANN S.J.

Bernd WANDER, *Gottesfürchtige und Sympathisanten. Studien zum heidnischen Umfeld von Diasporasynagogen* (WUNT 104). J.C.B.Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1998. xiv-276 p. 16,5 x 23,5. Ladenpreis: DM 178,—

Lo studio dell'Autore risponde finalmente, contraddicendola, alla tesi espressa qualche anno fa da Kraabel e accolta da alcuni studiosi, secondo cui una categoria di «timorati di Dio» nell'antichità non sarebbe mai esistita (cf. A.T. Kraabel, «The Disappearance of the Godfearers», *Numen* 28 [1981] 113-126). Non che egli sia il primo ad affrontare la questione; questa infatti, intrapresa già nel 1877 da J. Bernays con l'individuazione per la prima volta di un gruppo designato appunto come «Gottesfürchtige», conobbe in tempi più recenti diversi apporti, tra i quali si possono citare quelli di L. Robert, F. Siegert, e L.H. Feldman. Ma ora il Wander offre una più completa sistematizzazione dei dati a nostra disposizione, oltre a una più soddisfacente chiarificazione dei termini.

A livello di studi neotestamentari, l'esistenza della questione è notoriamente posta da quei passi di Luca negli Atti degli Apostoli, dove appunto si parla di φοβούμενοι/σεβομένοι τὸν θεόν (At 10,2-35; 13,1.26.43.50; 16,14; 17,1-2.17; 18,7). Il Wander però rimanda opportunamente l'esame di questi testi al termine del volume, premettendovi una lunga trattazione su quello che egli chiama lo «Umfeld» delle sinagoghe della diaspora (occidentale), cioè il campo di irradiazione del giudaismo sull'ambiente circostante, da cui peraltro provengono appunto le maggiori testimonianze. Queste, all'inizio degli studi in materia, erano ricercate prevalentemente nelle fonti letterarie ed era sulla loro base che di fatto veniva dibattuto il problema. Ma negli anni '70-'80 del secolo XX si moltiplicarono le iscrizioni offerte dall'archeologia, tra cui va assolutamente ricordata quella proveniente da Afrodisia (nell'entroterra di Efeso). Datata all'inizio del secolo III, l'iscrizione conta 87 righe su due facce (27 + 61) e contiene i nomi di 125 persone attinenti in qualche modo al giudaismo, di cui 68 sono Giudei, 3 sono Proseliti, e ben 54 sono definite θεοσεβείς cioè appunto «timorati di Dio» (equivalenti al 43% del totale), attestando dunque inequivocabilmente l'esistenza di un gruppo specifico di questo genere. Pubblicata nel 1987 a Cambridge da J. Reynolds e R. Tannenbaum, essa praticamente spazzava via tutte le ipotesi sulla inesistenza del gruppo in questione. Il Wander, oltre al commento nelle pp. 121-127, ne dà il testo greco completo in Appendice alle pp. 235-237.

In generale, il nostro Autore suddivide il suo volume in maniera schematica e chiara. Dopo una introduzione sulla storia e lo stato della ricerca, egli descrive l'ambiente vitale degli ebrei della diaspora dal punto di vista socio-religioso, da cui emerge anche l'importanza del giudaismo per l'affermarsi del cristianesimo nei vari centri urbani del Mediterraneo antico. Una specifica questione, quella concernente l'esistenza o meno di una vera e propria missione giudaica tra i Gentili, viene abbozzata alle pp. 29-32 per essere poi ripresa più ampiamente in seguito alle pp. 218-227 con l'adozione di una soluzione intermedia tra le opposte soluzioni. Particolarmente importante è la distinzione terminologica che viene operata: «Proselyten» vengono definiti quei Gentili che appartenevano ormai alla Sinagoga *de iure*, «Gottesfürchtige» quelli che, pur prescindendo dalla circoncisione, adottavano alcuni elementi del giudaismo come il monoteismo e alcune prescrizioni alimentari, gravitando anche fisicamente sulla sinagoga, «Sympathisanten» quelli che s'interessavano del bene delle sinagoghe e delle comunità giudaiche dall'esterno soltanto con appoggi economici o istituzionali, e «Nachahmer» quelli che potevano assumere e imitare alcune opinioni religiose ed etiche del giudaismo ma solo a livello personale senza avere alcun rapporto concreto con le sinagoghe stesse. Come si vede, sembrerebbe potersi parlare a questo proposito di cerchi concentrici, ma, stante la situazione fluida dei vari gruppi all'interno delle fonti così da sembrare a volte sovrapporsi e intersecarsi (soprattutto proseliti e timorati, o anche timorati e simpatizzanti; per esempio in At 13,43 si trova il costrutto σεβόμενοι προσήλυτοι), il Wander preferisce parlare giustamente di «überschneidende Kreise» (229), cioè cerchi che interferiscono l'uno con l'altro.

Il grosso del lavoro consiste in uno spoglio e nell'esame di tutte le fonti letterarie ed epigrafiche (queste riportate secondo la sticometria

originale) a nostra disposizione riguardanti la terminologia ebraica, greca e latina in materia, siano esse di provenienza pagana, giudaica o cristiana. A questo proposito, si comprenderà quanto sia difficile, se non impossibile, riferire qui sugli autori, le opere, e le iscrizioni prese in esame e analizzate. Basterà dire che il Wander procede con giudizi sostanzialmente equilibrati, sia sui testi antichi sia sulla bibliografia recente. Qua e là si notano purtroppo alcuni refusi tipografici specie nel greco; alla p. 194, terz'ultima riga dal fondo c'è anche un errore: invece di «Ephesus» bisogna leggere «Korinth»; inoltre, invece di una semplice allusione senza neanche la citazione del passo a p. 217, si sarebbe preferito avere una trattazione più ampia del cosiddetto decreto apostolico di At 15,20.29 in quanto attinente al problema dei Gentili che avessero voluto adottare la fede cristiana (in parallelo a quelli che avessero voluto accostarsi al giudaismo); su questa linea, sarebbe anche stato utile accennare al problema dei cosiddetti precetti noachici richiesti dalla Sinagoga ai Gentili.

A parte queste osservazioni periferiche, bisogna dare atto al Wander che egli ha messo nelle nostre mani una vera miniera. Egli in effetti, più che affrontare tutte le questioni storiche inerenti il giudaismo in ambito pagano, ha voluto fare un'indagine di tipo prevalentemente filologico, che rappresenta comunque la base di ogni ulteriore ricerca. Il materiale che vi si rinviene sarà utilissimo, anzi sicuramente necessario, tanto all'esegeta che voglia studiare con conoscenza di causa i passi lucani in questione (ma oltre agli Atti, cf. anche Lc 7,5 e Gv 12,20-32) sia allo storico delle origini cristiane al fine di inserire più adeguatamente il cristianesimo nel quadro esatto dei rapporti tra i Giudei e i Gentili. In questo modo si scoprirà la fisionomia più netta e la consistenza più solida di quell'anello mancante nella storia del cristianesimo, che sta a metà strada tra i Giudei e i Gentili, e che nel passaggio dal cristianesimo palestinese a quello di origine prettamente pagana costituì un *trait-d'union* tutt'ora inscindibile tra la radice santa e l'olivastro che andò ad innestarsi.

Pontificia Università Lateranense
P.za S. Giovanni in Laterano, 4
I-00120 Roma

Romano PENNA

NUNTII PERSONARUM ET RERUM

Pontificium Institutum Biblicum Annus academicus 1999-2000. I semestre

Auditores inscripti erant 387, qui in diversas categorias sic distribuebantur:

	Ad Doctoratum	Ad Licentiam	Hospites	Universi
Fac. Biblica	19	333	19	371
Fac. Orientalistica	—	1	15	16
Universi	19	334	34	387
Nationes	66	Alumni	387	
Dioceses	179	Alumni	198	
Inst. Religiosorum	55	Alumni	139	
Inst. Religiosarum	15	Alumnae	16	
Ex statu laicali	34	Alumnae	19	
		Alumni	15	

Laureae

Laureae in Re Biblica digni declarati sunt:

SCAIOLA, Donatella (28.02.2000) «*Una cosa ha detto Dio, due ne ho udite*». *Fenomeni di composizione all'interno del Salterio Masotico, con particolare riferimento al primo libro (Sal 1-41)* (magna cum laude). Moderator: P. Bovati.

PERON, Gian Paolo (26.05.2000) «*Seguitemi! Vi farò diventare pescatori di uomini!*» (Mc 1,17). *Gli imperativi ed esortativi di Gesù ai discepoli come elementi di un loro cammino formativo* (magna cum laude). Moderator: Prof. K. Stock.

TORTI, Rita (14.06.2000) «*Quando interrogare è pregare*». *La forza pragmatica delle proposizioni interrogative nel Salterio alla luce della letteratura accadica* (magna cum laude). Moderator: P. Bovati.

Doctor in Re Biblica renuntiatus est, typis edita thesi:

AZZAM, Jean, *Daniel ou le déchiffrement d'une souffrance devenue excessive. Tout le monde souffre* (extractum) Roma 2000.

LIBRI AD DIRECTIONEM MISSI

La liste ci-dessous comprend tous les livres adressés à *Biblica* qui sont en rapport avec les études bibliques, y compris ceux qui ne pourront faire l'objet d'un compte rendu. En signalant un ouvrage, la Revue ne se prononce pas à son sujet.

Les livres envoyés à la Revue ne seront pas retournés à l'expéditeur, même si aucun compte rendu n'en est publié (à moins qu'ils n'aient été envoyés sur demande de la Direction).

Les livres et les articles ou extraits de revues qui nous sont adressés seront communiqués au directeur de l'*Elenchus of Biblical Bibliography*.

Prière d'adresser les envois à la «Direction de *Biblica*, Pontificio Istituto Biblico, Via della Pilotta, 25, I-00187 Rome, Italie».

Broyles, Craig C., *Psalms* (New International Biblical Commentary – Old Testament Series 11). Peabody, MA, Hendrickson Publishers, 1999. xvi-539 p. 13,9 x 21,4

Corsani, Bruno, *La seconda lettera ai Corinzi*. Guida alla lettura (Piccola collana moderna. Serie biblica 83). Torino, Claudiana Editrice, 2000. 186 p. 12 x 20. Lit. 24.000 – €12,39

Cortese, Enzo, *Deuteronomistic Work* (Studium Biblicum Franciscanum Analecta 47). Jerusalem, Franciscan Printing Press, 1999. 178 p. 16,8 x 23,6. \$15.00

Cosby, Michael R., *Portraits of Jesus*. An Inductive Approach to the Gospels. Louisville, KY, Westminster – John Knox Press, 1999. xii-249 p. 17,8 x 25,4. £14.99

Dalton, William, *Interpretation*. Richmond, Victoria, Jesuit Publications, 1999. vi-134 p. 13,7 x 21,4

Fernández Marcos, Natalio – **Fernández Tejero**, Emilia, *Biblia y humanismo*. Textos, talentos y controversias del siglo XVI español (Fundación Universitaria Española – Monografías 69). Madrid, Fundación Universitaria Española, 1997. 293 p. 17 x 24

Fox, Harry – **Meacham**, Tirzah (eds.), *Introducing Tosefta*. Textual, Intratextual and Intertextual Studies. Hoboken, NJ, Ktav Publishing House, 1999. xx-340 p. 15,4 x 340p. \$79.50

Freedman, David Noel, *Psalms 119*. The Exaltation of Torah (Biblical and Judaic Studies 6). Winona Lake, IN, Eisenbrauns, 1999. viii-94 p. 15,7 x 34,6. \$19.50

Gryson, Roger, *Altlateinische Handschriften – Manuscripts vieux latins*. Répertoire descriptif. Première partie: Mss 1-275 d'après un manuscrit inachevé de Hermann Josef Frede (Vetus latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel. Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel 1,2A). Freiburg, Herder, 1999. 381 p. 15,7 x 24,5

Herzog, William R., *Jesus, Justice, and the Reign of God*. A Ministry of Liberation. Louisville, KY, John Knox Press, 2000. xvi-316 p. 15,3 x 22,9. £14.99

Hillert, Sven, *Limited and Universal Salvation*. Text-Oriented and Hermeneutical Study of Two Perspectives in Paul (Coniectanea Biblica New Testament Series 31). Stockholm, Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1999. 272 p. 15,6 x 22. SEK 206,—

Hochschild, Ralph, *Sozialgeschichtliche Exegese*. Entwicklung, Geschichte und Methodik einer neutestamentlichen Forschungsrichtung (NTOA 42). Freiburg (Schweiz), Universitätsverlag – Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999. 297 p. 16 x 23,5. SFr 88,—

Ibáñez Arana, Andrés, *Para comprender el libro del Génesis*. Estella (Navarra), Editorial Verbo Divino, 1999. 322 p. 22 x 22

Isserlin, B.S.J., *The Israelites*. London, Thames and Hudson, 1998. 304 p. 18 x 26. £20.00

Iwe, John Chijioke, *Jesus in the Synagogue of Capernaum: The Pericope and Its Programmatic Character for the Gospel of Mark*. An Exegetico-Theological Study of Mk 1:21-28 (Tesi Gregoriana – Serie Teologia 57). Roma, Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 1999. 360 p. 17 x 24. Lit. 35.000 - \$21.00

Jeremias, Jörg, *Osea*. Traduzione e commento. Traduzione italiana di Franco Ronchi (Antico Testamento 24.1). Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 2000. 276 p. 15 x 21. Lit. 50.000

Jervis, L. Ann, *Galatians* (New International Biblical Commentary – New Testament Series 9). Peabody, MA, Hendrickson Publishers, 1999. xiv-172 p. 13,9 x 21,4

Klauck, Hans-Josef, *Vom Zauber des Anfangs*. Biblische Besinnungen (Franziskanische Impulse 3). Werl, Dietrich-Coelde-Verlag, 1999. 169 p. 11 x 18. DM 19,80

Levine, Lee I., *Judaism and Hellenism in Antiquity*. Conflict or Confluence? Peabody, MA, Hendrickson Publishers, 1999. xiv-227 p. 13,7 x 21,5

Longenecker, Richard N., *New Wine into Fresh Wineskins*. Contextualizing the Early Christian Confessions. Peabody, MA, Hendrickson Publishers, 1999. 207 p. 13,7 x 21,5

McArthur, John, *The Topical Bible*. Nashville, TN, Word Publishing, 1999. viii-1592 p. 17 x 24,2. \$34.99

Meyers, Eric M. (ed.), *Galilee through the Centuries*. Confluence of Cultures (Duke Judaic Studies 1). Winona Lake, IN, Eisenbrauns, 1999. xiv-429 p. 15,8 x 33,5. \$42.50

Müller-Kessler, Christa – Sokoloff, Michael (eds.), *The Catechism of Cyril of Jerusalem in the Christian Aramaic Version* (A Corpus of Christian Palestinian Aramaic 5). Groningen, Styx Publications, 1999. 261 p. 18 x 24,2. Dfl 185,—

Müller-Kessler, Christa – Sokoloff, Michael (eds.), *The Christian Palestinian Aramaic New Testament Version from the Early Period Gospels* (A Corpus of Christian Palestinian Aramaic 2A). Groningen, Styx Publications, 1998. 280 p. 8 plates. 18 x 24,2. Dfl 160,—

Müller-Kessler, Christa – Sokoloff, Michael (eds.), *The Christian Palestinian Aramaic New Testament Version from the Early Period Acts of the Apostles and Epistles* (A Corpus of Christian Palestinian Aramaic 2B). Groningen, Styx Publications, 1998. 322 p. 16 plates. 18 x 24,2. Dfl 160,—

Murphy, Roland – **Huwiler**, Elizabeth, *Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs* (New International Biblical Commentary 12). Peabody, Hendrickson Publishers, 1999. xvi-312 p. 14 x 21,4

Murphy, Roland E., *The Book of Job*. A Short Reading. New York – Mahwah, NJ, Paulist Press, 1999. 137 p. 13,7 x 20,3. \$14.95

Nasuti, Harry P., *Defining the Sacred Songs*. Genre, Tradition and the Post-Critical Interpretation of the Psalms (JSOTSS 218). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1999. 220 p. 16 x 24. £35.00 – \$57.50

Nay, Reto, *Jahwe im Dialog*. Kommunikationsanalytische Untersuchung von Ez 14,1-11 unter Berücksichtigung des dialogischen Rahmens in Ez 8-11 und Ez 20 (AnBib 141). Roma, Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1999. xii-424 p. 16,5 x 24. Lit. 50.000 – \$30.00

Neusner, Jacob – **Green**, William Scott (eds.), *Dictionary of Judaism in the Biblical Period*. Peabody, MA, Hendrickson Publishers, 1999. Previously published: New York, Macmillan Library Reference, 1996. xxvi-693 p. 18,5 x 24,2

O'Brien, Peter T., *The Letter to the Ephesians* (The Pillar New Testament Commentary). Grand Rapids, MI, W. B. Eerdmans – Leicester, UK, Appollos, 1999. xxiv-536 p. 16 x 23,7. \$40.00

Origène, *Homélies sur les Nombres II* (Homélies XI-XIX). Texte latin de W.A. **Baehrens**, nouvelle édition par Louis Doutreleau. (Sources Chrétiennes 442). Paris, Éditions du Cerf, 1999. 417 p. 12,5 x 19,5. FF 232,—

Osborne, Thomas P. – **Stricher**, Joseph, *L'année jubilaire et la remise des dettes*. Repères bibliques. Paris, Bayard Éditions – Centurion, 1999. 126 p. 15 x 22. FF 98,—

Patrick, Dale, *The Rhetoric of Revelation in the Hebrew Bible* (Overtures to Biblical Theology). Minneapolis, MN, Fortress Press, 1999. xx-212 p. 14 x 21,5. \$20.00

Polaski, Sandra Hack, *Paul and the Discourse of Power* (Gender, Culture, Theory 8 – The Biblical Seminar 62). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1999. 151 p. 15,7 x 23,4. £12.95 – \$19.95

Pomeroy, Arthur J. (ed.), *Arius Dydimus*. Epitome of Stoic Ethics (Texts and Translations – Graeco Roman Series 14). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1999. x-160 p. 15,7 x 23,5. \$35.00

Porten, Bezalel – **Yardeni**, Ada (eds.), *Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt*. Newly Copied, Edited and Translated into Hebrew and English. 4. *Ostraca and Assorted Inscriptions* (Texts and Studies for Students). Jerusalem, The Hebrew University – Department of the History of the Jewish People, 1999. lxxiv-304 p. 9 foldouts. 24 x 34. \$80.00

Porter, Stanley – **Cross**, Anthony R. (eds.), *Baptism, the New Testament and the Church*. Historical and Contemporary Studies in Honor of R.E.O. White (JSNTSS 171). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1999. 497 p. 16 x 24. £55.00 – \$85.00

Radner, Karen (ed.), *The Prosography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire*. Volume 1, Part I: A (The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project). Helsinki, University Press, 1998. xxx-240 p. 17,7 x 25

Radner, Karen (ed.), *The Prosography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire*. Volume 1, Part II: B-G (The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project). Helsinki, University Press, 1999. x-pp. 241-433-B-34 p. 17,7 x 25

Redditt, Paul L., *Daniel* (The New Century Bible Commentary). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1999. xxvi-211 p. 13,9 x 21,6. £12.95 – \$19.95

Reichardt, Michael, *Psychologische Erklärung der paulinischen Damaskusvision?* Ein Beitrag zur interdisziplinären Gespräch zwischen Exegese und Psychologie seit dem 18. Jahrhundert (SBB 42). Stuttgart, Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1999. 389 p. 14,8 x 25. DM 89 – ÖS 650 – SFr 85 – €45,50

Reinhardt, Klaus, *Bibelkommentare spanischer Autoren (1500-1700)*. II: *Autoren M-Z*. Madrid, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas – Centro de Estudios Históricos, 1999. xxii- 428 p. 17 x 24,5

Remigius Autissiodorensis, *Expositio super Genesim*. Cura et studio Burton Van Name **Edwards** (Corpus Christianorum – Continuatio Mediaevalis 136). Turnhout, Brepols, 1999. lxxviii-251 p. 16,3 x 25,8. BF 4.921,47 – €122

Rofé, Alexander, *La composizione del Pentateuco*. Un'introduzione. Traduzione dall'ebraico di Maria Patrizia Sciumbata (Studi biblici 35). Bologna, Edizioni Dehoniane, 1999. 160 p. 13,9 x 21,7. Lit. 27.000 – €13,94

Rollins, Wayne G., *Soul and Psyche*. The Bible in Psychological Perspective. Minneapolis, MN, Fortress Press, 1999. viii-280 p. 15,3 x 22,8. \$22.00

Roukema, Riemer, *Gnosis and Faith in Early Christianity*. An Introduction to Gnosticism. Translated by John Bowden. London, SCM Press, 1999. xii-212 p. 13,6 x 21,6. £14.95

Sandrin, Luciano (a cura di), *"Che cosa ho fatto di male?"* Malattia e senso di colpa (Salute e salvezza 13). Torino, Edizioni Camilliane, 1999. 112 p. 15 x 21. Lit. 20.000

Scarpat, Giuseppe (a cura di), *Libro della Sapienza*. Testo, traduzione, introduzione e commento. Volume terzo (Biblica – Testi e studi 6). Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 1999. 461 p. 16,2 x 23,8. Lit. 89.000

Schwartz, Baruch J., *The Holiness Legislation*. Studies in the Holiness Code. Jerusalem, The Magnes Press – The Hebrew University, 1999. 448 p. 16 x 23. \$20.00

Shearing, Linda S. – **McKenzie, Steven L.** (eds.), *Those Elusive Deuteronomists*. The Phenomenon of Pan-Deuteronomism (JSOTSS 268). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1999. 288 p. 16 x 24. £50.00 – \$85.00

Smith, Richard, *A Concise Coptic-English Lexicon*. Second Edition (SBL Resources for Biblical Study 35). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1999. xvii-59 p. 15,6 x 23,7. \$36.00

Society of Biblical Literature. 1999 *Seminar Papers* (Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers Series 38). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 1999. 642 p. 15,4 x 22,7. \$35.00

Starbuck, Scott R.A., *Court Oracles in the Psalms*. The So-Called Royal Psalms in their Ancient Near Eastern Context (SBL Dissertation Series 172). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1999. xx-271 p. 14,5 x 22,3. \$37.00

Stegemann, Ekkehard W. – **Stegemann, Wolfgang**, *The Jesus Movement*. A Social History of Its First Century. Translated by O.C. Dean. Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 1999. xx-532 p. 16 x 23,5. \$45.00

Still, Todd D., *Conflict at Thessalonica*. A Pauline Church and its Neighbours (JSNTSS 183). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1999. 337 p. 16 x 24. £50.00 – \$85.00

Stoops, Robert F. – MacDonald, Dennis R., *The Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles in Intertextual Perspectives* (Semeia 80). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1997. vi-303 p. 15,3 x 23,5. \$19.95

Stronstad, Roger, *The Prophethood of All Believers. A Study in Luke's Charismatic Theology* (Journal of Pentecostal Studies Supplement Series 16). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1999. 136 p. 15,6 x 23,3. £10.95 – \$13.95

Supplément au dictionnaire de la Bible, sous la direction de Jacques **Briend** et Édouard **Cothenet**. Fascicule 72: Sophonie – Sumer. Paris, Letouzay & Ané, Éditeurs, 1999. Col. 1-256. 20 x 28. FF 341,—

Tàbet, Michelangelo (a cura di), *La Sacra Scrittura, anima della teologia*. Atti del IV Simposio Internazionale della Facoltà di Teologia della Pontificia Università della Santa Croce. Città del Vaticano, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1999. 279 p. 17,1 x 24,1. Lit. 33.000

Talshir, Zipora, *1 Esdras. From Origin to Translation* (Septuagint and Cognate Studies 47). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1999. xii-305 p. 14,6 x 22,4. \$57.00

Theissen, Gerd – Merz, Annette, *Il Gesù storico. Un manuale*. Traduzione dal tedesco di Enzo Gatti. (Biblioteca biblica 25). Brescia, Editrice Queriniana, 1999. 803 p. 16 x 23. Lit. 120.000

Thüsing, Wilhelm, *Die neutestamentlichen Theologien und Jesus Christus. Grundlegung einer Theologie des Neuen Testaments. III. Einzigkeit Gottes und Jesus-Christus-Ereignis (mit Studien zum Verhältnis von Juden und Christen)*. Herausgegeben von Thomas **Söding**. Münster, Aschendorff Verlag, 1999. xvi-444. 14,5 x 22. DM 78,—

Todisco, Vito Angelo (a cura di), *Opus Solidaritatis Pax*. Studi in onore di Mons. Antonio Forte vescovo di Avellino. Avellino, Istituto di Scienze Religiose San Giuseppe Moscati, 1999. 885 p. 17,5 x 25

Ulmer, Rivka (ed.), *Pesiqta Rabbati*. A Synoptic Edition of Pesiqta Rabbati Based upon All Extant Manuscripts and the Editio Princeps. Volume II (South Florida Studies in the History of Judaism 200). Atlanta, GA, Scholars Press, 1999. xi-507 p. 22 x 28,7. \$129.95

Wachob, Wesley Hiram, *The Voice of Jesus in the Social Rhetoric of James* (SNTSMS 106). Cambridge, University Press, 2000. xiv-251 p. 14,5 x 22,2. £37.50 - \$59.95

Waltner, Erland – Charles, J. Daryl, *1-2 Peter, Jude* (Believers Church Bible Commentary). Scottdale, PA – Waterloo, Ont., Herald Press, 1999. 352p. 14,4 x 22,2. US\$19.19 – Can\$29.76

Van Seters, John, *The Pentateuch. A Social-Science Commentary* (Trajectories 1). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1999. 233 p. 15,7 x 23,2. Cloth: £45.00 – \$79.00; paper: £16.95 – \$28.00

Van Voorst, Robert E., *Building Your New Testament Greek Vocabulary*. Second Edition (SBL Resources for Biblical Study 40). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1999. xii-107 p. 15,6 x 23,7. \$7.50

Vaughn, Andrew G., *Theology, History, and Archaeology in the Chronicler's Account of Ezekiah* (Archaeology and Biblical Studies 4). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1999. xviii-240 p. \$39.00

Verburg, Winfried, *Passion als Tragödie*. Die literarische Gattung der antiken Tragödie als Gestaltungsprinzip der Johannespassion (SBS 182).

Stuttgart, Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1999. 136 p. 13,5 x 20,7. DM 39,80 – OS 291 – SFr 38 – €20,35; Abo-Preis: DM 35,80 – ÖS 283 SFr 34 – €18,30

Watson, Francis, *Agape, Eros, Gender. Towards a Pauline Sexual Ethic*. Cambridge, University Press, 2000. x-268 p. 14,2 x 22,2. £37.50 – \$59.95

Wénin, André, *Isaac ou l'épreuve d'Abraham*. Approche narrative de Genèse 22 (Le livre et le rouleau 8). Bruxelles, Éditions Lessius, 1999. 102 p. 14,5 x 20,5. FF 89 – FB 545,

Wijesinghe, Shirley Lal, *Jeremiah 34,8-22. Structure and Redactional History of the Masoretic Text and of the Septuagint Hebrew Vorlage* (Logos 37,1-2). Colombo (Sri Lanka), Centre for Society and Religion, 1999. xii-233 p. 16,9 x 22,5. Rs. 200 - \$18.00

Wilder, Amos N., *Early Christian Rhetoric. The Language of the Gospel*. Reprint. Peabody, MA, Hendrickson Publishers, 1999. xxxii-135 p. 13,7 x 21,5

Williams, David J., *Paul's Metaphors. Their Context and Character*. Peabody, MA, Hendrickson Publishers, 1999. xxvi-385 p. 16 x 23,1

Williams, David S., *The Structure of 1 Maccabees* (The Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 31). Washington D.C., The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1999. vi-152 p. 15,3 x 22,8. \$7.00

Williams, Jay G., *The Times and Life of Edward Robinson*. Connecticut Yankee in King Solomon's Court (Biblical Scholarship in North America 19). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 1999. 384 p. 15,7 x 23,6. \$39.00

Witherington, Ben, III, *Jesus the Seer. The Progress of Prophecy*. Peabody, MA, Hendrickson Publishers, 1999. xviii-427 p. 16 x 23,1

Wohlers, Michael, *Heilige Krankheit*. Epilepsie in antiker Medizin, Astrologie und Religion (Marburger Theologische Studien 57). Marburg, N.G. Elwert Verlag, 1999. x-298 p. 17 x 24. DM 58,—

ISSN 0006-0887

PIETRO BOCCACCIO, Direttore Responsabile

Autorizz. Tribunale di Roma n. 6229 del 24-3-1958 del Reg. della Stampa



Associato all'Unione Stampa Periodica Italiana

Finito di stampare il 22 luglio 2000

Tip. «Don Bosco» – Via Prenestina, 468 – 00171 Roma